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(Thereupon, Volume II continues without omission.)

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Attorney Barge-Miles, do we have a quorum?

ATTORNEY BARGE-MILES: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: We're going to continue.

Where is Dr. Mangum?

All right, we're going to get started. We're moving into the second phase of our meeting today. Thank you for all who have joined us, and we will recognize the presence of our former presidents shortly.

But prior to heading there, we have a request from an esteemed Rattler to address the board. He's come in from Miami, and I decided to grant the time.

Where is Mayor Gilbert?

Mayor Gilbert, if you would, please. Members of the Board, Mayor of Miami Gardens and FAMU Alumn, Oliver Gilbert.

MAYOR GILBERT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, the Board of Trustees, Dr. Mangum, and I would be remiss if I didn't say -- I can't take a lot of time because I am actually awed by this room. The people in this room I have respected all of my life. I was a Rattler when Dr. Humphries was at FAMU, and getting to
be Mayor was easy because I came out of FAMU Student Government. FAMU Student Government was hard, so it was -- and, you know, later today I'm going to be (inaudible) director, and I'm going to be talking to him about bringing the Orange Blossom Classic back to South Florida. And we're going to talk and try to work that out with him, but I want to talk to you-all just a moment about what Miami Gardens is, my city.

First, we're the home of the Miami Dolphins. We're the largest black city in the state of Florida. We have 110,000 people. We're the largest black city south of Atlanta. We are the largest collection of black working class in academics and professionals in the state of Florida. And we're some place that loves FAMU.

It's not just a football game. It wouldn't be just a football game. When I was a kid and I used to go, it was an experience. It made it so when I got accepted to Morehouse and University of Florida, I filled out those applications because I wasn't sure FAMU would accept me. FAMU accepted me and it was decided.

We need you back in South Florida. We need your presence to be back in South Florida. When they came, it wasn't just the football players; it was the band,
it was the gathering, it was the recruitment, it was
the students everyone wanted to be here. We were it.
We can be it again.

I'm Mayor of a city that loves you. They love
you because, well, first, there's two other Rattlers
on the case with me, but we won't let them not love
you. And you come to South Florida, you come to Miami
Gardens and it won't just be, "Hey, you know what?
This is some money for a game." We will build a
partnership and it will be something past a stadium,
past a game.

People who want to do business with me, they want
to give you internships. They want to help you on the
projects that you have. When I listened to your
meeting before, and it was great, and I -- some of the
things I talk about in my city all the time, and I
tell my crossing guards that being the face of the
City to the people that are crossing their kids;
that's the same whether it be your secretaries, your
finance or whoever it is.

If that's the only people they see as the face of
the City, well, I'm the face of FAMU. I think I've
been smart all my life, but FAMU taught me how to
talk. They gave me confidence. My parents told me
when they sent me away they couldn't get me to say a
word; when they brought me back, they couldn't get me
to shut up.

You know, when I went to law school, I graduated
from University of Miami with Honors. That's because
FAMU, you can tell a Rattler when they're sitting in
that classroom. I want to give that experience. I
want to give that exposure to as many of my students,
my children, my city and South Florida as possible.
The game will give experience, it will help create a
relationship and it will help create memories and
traditions.

We'll be meeting with our chair director. I hope
to see you all in South Florida soon.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Thank you, Mayor.

We look for revenue to address our challenges, in
our budget in athletics. So we look for revenue, but
we also look for willing partners; something that was
handled by the administration and not by the Board.

I would note that I think the trustee that's been
most vocal about it is, to my left, to your right,
Trustee McWilliams. And in a capacity as a board, I
think we do need to take it up to a community level
and then bring it to the Board. The discussion about
guaranteed games versus the other ways to create ways
to get there.

So when there are ways to go to a willing partner and achieve the same or more revenue than going and playing one of these D1 schools, I think that's from a branding perspective, university perspective, that's something we need to look at from a policy perspective in terms of how we proceed.

But I'll open it up for questioning. I'll start with Trustee Williams, but if there are any other comments, questions, members of the Board, while we have the Mayor here.

Trustee McWilliams, any comments?

TRUSTEE McWILLIAMS: No. I just thank the Mayor for coming. I had the discussion with the athletic director about, that I gave him a copy of the program from a packet of the Classic of some years ago to try and get him in that field. I think the complication yesterday kind of helped him -- Friday -- helped him get in the Rattler spirit of what we were talking about. But there was a difference between -- and he recognizes this very well -- a guarantee game where you are usually paying somebody to beat you, and taking a team down -- maybe your selection, maybe Southern, Grambling, some other big named black school -- and having a game where you may win and
people see you in a positive light.

And I've said, other than the City of Orlando, there's no major urban area in the state, in the last decade, where he had just grown up and had an opportunity to see FAMU in a game. Really, if you went to Tampa, you would play in South Florida. If you went to Miami, you went to Gainesville. And we don't need that.

So I agree with you, and I'm sure that you and Milton Overton will get together and announce and aid in the discussion and that maybe I can help. I appreciate you coming.

MR. GILBERT: Thank you all for letting me speak, and let me add something else. We're home of (inaudible) and last year it was 73,000. We know how to make stuff hot. We know how to cross sale and work with Broward and Dade. We know -- we've been able to pull it together such that we get money from the Broward Visitor's Bureau and the Dade Visitor's Bureau, so we can do something exceedingly and abundantly special. We can do that.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Trustee Alston, are you there?

TRUSTEE ALSTON: Yes, Mr. Chair, I'm on, and I heard the comments by the mayor.
CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Okay. I am going to ask you to work with the mayor, given your close proximity, you and Trustee Washington, to the extent possible. If y'all could work with the mayor and then also with the administration from a policy perspective, taking Trustee McWilliams' comments, and come back to us with a recommendation about what our posture is from a branding perspective, how it affects our students, our alumni base, our stakeholders.

And again, if you can engage Mayor Gilbert to see how this information come back to the Board, I think that would be a good thing.

But Trustee Alston and Washington, given your proximity, I think that would be a good thing. And Mayor, I would ask members of our Board to put us in a position; I understand it's better from a policy perspective.

MAYOR GILBERT: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Members, any additional comments, questions, concerns for Mayor Gilbert?

TRUSTEE LAWSON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Thank you, Mayor.

MAYOR GILBERT: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: I have received a number of questions about the timing of our meeting today and so
I'll add some clarity very briefly.

A few things. I mentioned before on the strategic planning process, there was a request from University President, Dr. Mangum, to have some leadership time with the Board. And I think that went from a conversation about orientation and the roles of board members, to being able to have a block of time that was dedicated and her choice and decision was to use that for strategic planning, and that was the block that we utilized earlier this morning.

The second half of the conversation was born out of a meeting, a lunch meeting, that I was fortunate to have with all of the living former presidents of Florida A&M University.

Like Mayor Gilbert, I was humbled to be what I considered to be in the presence of such greatness. I mean, every Rattler can know and understand what it was like having their president when they were at Florida A&M University.

In that discussion, it was very fruitful. I heard things that I was not familiar with, but I was most impressed from this distinguished group of Rattlers in how they discussed their successes, and how many of the things would be applicable to where we are now. And so, I told you when you reelect or
elected me to a full two-year term that we would look at the Board's responsibility, the Board setting goals and objectives, the Board holding itself accountable. But also looking from the visioning perspective, and I thought from that meeting it made a lot of sense to be in a position to share that entire information with the entire Board.

So the Presidents themselves collectively requested the opportunity to address the board. We discussed potentially Orlando, but then the thought was Homecoming, we're here. We were in this room two years ago for a Sunday meeting, and that's how we got there on the discussion with the former presidents.

Agenda items, the governance, I explained to you that was driven simply because operating procedures require it. The other issue or the other concern is the employment contract for Dr. Mangum.

Now, all of you have copies of the contract. We are contractually bound at the first meeting after -- it's 5.3 of the contract.

It says, "At its first meeting at September 3rd of each year, the Board shall take a vote on the payment of her bonus."

So the reason is that an agenda item is because we are legally, at our first meeting, required to take
it you up.

So with that said, you all have copies of the agenda. We'll have the discussion on the presidential bonus. We will move to the strategic planning and visioning session with the former presidents.

Dr. Bryant is the only former president who is not joining us in person here today. We have the presidents grouped in three different pairings. We tried to pair folks up based on their personalities, so I hope you-all are okay with it. We made sure Dr. Smith and Dr. Humphries were not together. Hey, it is what it is.

Each of the presidents will have 15 minutes. We will ask that you adhere to the time out of respect for your colleagues, but we'll have 15 minutes in the pairings of two. And then there will be a question and answering session, and I asked you in advance to oblige me if we have to bring it to a conclusion, but that will get through the sessions.

At some point in there, we will actually take a break. The next thing we will hear after that will be comments from our Board Vice Chair, with regard to this entire visioning process, and the strategic planning process, and how your input helps us in that process as we grow.
We will have remarks of the board members, closing remarks from the Chair, and we'll move to adjourn. So I felt the need to explain the agenda simply because we had a number of questions.

But with that said, we're going to move to our next item which is the presidential bonus. Article 5.3 of President Mangum's -- and we're going to recognize each of you as you go, so if you'll hold off on that.

Article 5.3 of President Mangum's employment contract provides some language.

Attorney Barge-Miles, will you read that language for us?

ATTORNEY BARGE-MILES: "5.3 performance bonus. Based upon her achievement of specific annual goals and objectives, which have been mutually agreed upon in writing by Dr. Mangum and the Board, Dr. Mangum may be eligible to receive an annual performance bonus not to exceed 10 percent of the annual based salary as provided for in subparagraph 4.0, contingent upon the availability of funds from the FAMU Foundation.

"At its first meeting after September 30th of each year, the Board shall take a vote on payment of a bonus which shall be proportional to the goals and objectives met and shall state the amount thereof."
Upon Board approval of a performance bonus, payment of said bonus shall be made within 60 days."

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Thank you. Members of the Board, this is our first board meeting after September 30th, so we're required to take a vote on payment of a bonus. Is there a motion?

TRUSTEE WARREN: Mr. Chair, can I ask a question?

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Trustee Warren.

TRUSTEE WARREN: The agreement says that if there is a bonus to be made, and it may be or may not be, that there's some parameters under which Dr. Mangum's performance, some standards, to determine if there will be a bonus, based upon these performance measures, if I heard that correctly and I read it right.

So I'm looking for, what is the recommendation to us based on the performance evaluation?

TRUSTEE MOORE: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: You're asking for a recommendation from whom?

TRUSTEE WARREN: From the Evaluation Committee.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Has the Evaluation Committee met to consider this item?

TRUSTEE MOORE: Actually, this was identified in our timeline and is not followed in the scope of the
Presidential Evaluation Committee; however, what you can refer to is the presidential evaluation tool, and we capture that in element one. So actually, every board member had an opportunity to weigh in on those goals that were identified, and they ran from July 1 of last year through April of this year.

I have my copy in front of me, and it's the same one that's published, but it looks at annual priorities and goals. That's the one that was identified, the first one.

Of the 12 trustees that voted, 7 rated it as having met and 5 as having not met at that time.

TRUSTEE WARREN: Met the goals?

TRUSTEE MOORE: Met the goals, collectively. All of the ones that have been approved previously.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Members of the Board, the contractual language, I have conferred with legal counsel in regard to our requirements, and the language binds us to take an action, and so this is a Board action and not a Committee action.

We have to take some action today, and I would entertain a motion with regard to the potential --

TRUSTEE WARREN: Sorry, Mr. Chair. The action could be no action?

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: The action -- you're
correct, Trustee Warren, the action could be no action.

But again, you all remember we had a extensive debate on this, and this is one of the provisions that binds us in a position, where in some cases it puts us at a contractual disadvantage. But it's not something we're forcing on our own; we're required to do it, and we're at a point where a motion can and will be entertained with regard to how to proceed.

TRUSTEE WARREN: So I'm looking for --

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Trustee Warren and Trustee Shannon.

TRUSTEE WARREN: That particular sentence, "which shall be proportional to the goals and objectives met," which leads me to believe that what we offer would have some fractional components to it. If there are 10 goals to meet and I meet five of them, then you only get the bonus on the five as opposed, if you get what I'm getting at here.

So I don't know if general counsel is in the room or not, but this would appear that if we're going to make this recommendation, or approve on recommendation based on a bonus, it should be based on the individual goals; our collective view of whether she met the goals in general or not.
But on Goal Number 1, the consensus was that she met that goal. If so, now one-fifth of the five goals have been met, so if we do a bonus of some dollar amount, it's one-fifth of that.

So I can't get to that arithmetic without knowing which of the goals, or the number of goals that we outlined for her to perform, and what percent of them were in fact achieved.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: I'll make the comment and I'll recognize Trustee Shannon. I recall that you voted in favor of this provision, and so the time to have that conversation most likely would have been during the discussion phase for the approval of the language. And so that discussion did not -- please allow me, Trustee Warren, without interruption. I allowed you to proceed; please allow me to proceed.

The time to have had that conversation was before the approval of the agreement, in my opinion. We are now in a posture where we are bound, and so, while there can be discussion of A, B, C, and D, we are in a position where the provision has not been waived. I have asked what are the options of the board. The provision could have been waived. It has not been waived. If the President decided to waive this and forego this discussion, we're able to do that legally.
The second option is for the Board to take a vote, and that vote could include a decision to not grant a bonus, or it could include a proportional amount or it could include up to the maximum amount. But the language contractually binds us to take an action, and that's why and how we're here.

Trustee Shannon?

TRUSTEE SHANNON: So Mr. Chair, I don't think that we need to go back through the performance evaluation, because I think what we're called upon here is to make a vote on the bonus, and we have a formula by which to make a vote on the bonus. And so what I was going to ask Trustee Moore is, we had, what, 10 or 11 objectives through that period, July 1st to April? I can't remember how many of those, but of those, if we could verify how many there were.

Could you also tell us of those objectives, that every single board member provided an evaluation on, how many of those did Dr. Mangum, was she deemed to have met or exceeded, for the bonus year that we're talking about? Because that would provide the guidance we're looking for in terms of what proportional amount of bonus we would award her.

TRUSTEE MOORE: Mr. Chair?
CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Trustee Moore.

TRUSTEE MOORE: I'll give you that number, but I'll ask legal counsel to weigh on this because the language specifically talks about what was approved in writing, and the goals that were approved in writing only relate to Item 1 and not the 11 elements, once we have flexibility to take into account and later add on, and that does not require for approval in writing. So really the conversation is one, and whether we want to. But it's 11, and of that number just for your reference --

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Trustee Moore, what is that one? You said there was one in writing?

TRUSTEE MOORE: The annual parts in goals, which fell in alignment from July 1 through April 30th; that's what was approved in writing.

Our additional goals carried us through the end of performance year, June 30. So the one that would tie-back to this back -- if legal counsel would weigh in on Item 1.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Legal counsel, if you would weigh in with regard to Trustee Moore's question.

ATTORNEY McKNIGHT: Is it okay if I stand?

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Please.

ATTORNEY McKNIGHT: I agree whole-heartedly with
what Trustee Moore said, is that if you go back to the early evaluation process, there was a document that was submitted to this board sometime last year. It had a performance plan proposal, May, 2014, through April, 2015. Those are the goals and objectives that were mutually agreed upon by both parties.

And based on what Trustee Moore said, seven of the trustees in the evaluation instrument determined she had met those goals or had exceeded those goals based upon that analysis chart.

TRUSTEE MOORE: The only clarification is none voted for exceed; seven met, and five did not meet.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Does that clear your -- does that answer your question? So board members, in an effort to move this along, there's -- we haven't set our policy or our thoughts in terms of how we're going to govern ourselves in handling these types of concerns. One could be -- and I'll throw some out there -- one could be that exceeding expectations warrant a bonus. One could be meeting expectations warrants a bonus. I think we all would agree not meeting expectation would warrant no bonus.

And so, collectively, the Board is in a posture where it can and it has to make a decision. And so we have come to that point in the conversation where if -
- I mean, at some point is going to have to be a
motion to proceed. I think we all understand what the
options are; if you don't, please let me know. But
being required to take a vote on a bonus kind of binds
our hands and puts us in this posture.

    Now, years ago we had an evaluation process of
contracts that allowed us to put the Board in a more
favorable position, and that may be the next move to
make sure we're not back into a position where our
hands are tied.

    So with that, are there any members of the board
who have not spoken who wish to speak on the matter?

    TRUSTEE McWILLIAMS: I'll speak.

    CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: I have Trustee McWilliams,
Trustee Washington and Trustee Lawson.

    Trustee McWilliams?

    TRUSTEE McWILLIAMS: My position, my feeling
about it is, you know, meeting expectations does not
warrant a bonus. I do not know of any place that just
meeting expectations warrants a bonus. It means you
have a job and you get paid. You exceed expectations,
and the degree to which you exceed expectations
determines how big the bonus is and whatever. So
that's kind of what I've always thought about in terms
of bonuses. It's for exceptional performance.
CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Thank you, Trustee McWilliams.

Trustee Washington.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: I just have a clarification question. Is there going to be a motion as to whether or not the bonus, and then another motion as to the percentage? Because it's up to -- is that our discretion as well?

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: So I will give you the opinion of the chair after we hear from legal counsel with regard to what we are contractually obliged to do.

Legal counsel?

ATTORNEY McKNIGHT: Once again, and if you have the contract in front of you, it's 5.3. Dr. Mangum may be eligible to receive an annual bonus; that's what it says. So the conversation is appropriate, but the way the language is written, Dr. Mangum is not entitled to receive a bonus. But the Board has to take a vote one way or the other, right? Either vote for it or not vote for it. And hopefully, if there was a vote for a bonus, that percentage amount would be determined as part of the bonus.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: As a part of the bonus?

ATTORNEY McKNIGHT: Yeah. I wouldn't see any
reason why you would have a separate motion.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Does that answer your question, Trustee?

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: I mean, yes and no. Because the question is up to; it's the "may or may not," and it's "up to 10 percent." So you may have a varying opinion as to the may or may not based on the percentage.

TRUSTEE MOORE: I would agree.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: As the opinion of the chair and the concurrence of legal counsel, if there was a motion with regard to a bonus, that it would include a percentage.

And so we've heard counsel, our University counsel, with regard to where we are legally bound. To answer your question directly, it's the opinion of the Chair that any such motion would have to include a percentage or would need to include a percentage, but it is the pleasure of the Board. So a motion could be made without one. I hope that answers your question. I had McWilliams, Washington, and Trustee Lawson.

TRUSTEE LAWSON: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. One of the challenges, I think, that we're dealing with is the structure of the document. The structure of the document does not call out a specific process whereby
you can do a fair -- a fair and equal proportion;
meaning, it does not call out to say for a specific
number of objectives attained, it should be two,
three, up to 10. It simply says 10.

You know, we have talked about this in the past.
Obviously, now is not the time to correct it, but I'll
just try and stick with the only facts we have. And
that is, the results of the performance review said, I
think meets was the majority, right? And it was
not -- it was not meet in about five. But the
majority said meets.

And per Dr. McWilliams' suggestion, we're talking
about awarding a bonus for over and above performance.
So the President's performance review -- Trustee
Moore, correct me if I'm wrong -- says meets. With
that language, I feel like we're in a posture where we
can make a decision based on the loosely-worded
language here.

And my motion would be that we forfeit the bonus
for this past academic year.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Motion has -- is that a
motion?

TRUSTEE LAWSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Motion has been made. Is
there a second?
TRUSTEE WOODY: Second.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Motion has been made and properly seconded.

Is there a discussion on this item?

TRUSTEE SHANNON: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Trustee Shannon.

TRUSTEE SHANNON: I just want to put another thought out there. Because in my world, which we all know is private sector, there are very large, very professional organizations that have performance evaluation and bonus systems built on the contribution and more of the employees. And so, it is not a general rule based on my 30-plus years in the private sector that "a meet" does not warrant a bonus, because "a meet" represents a contribution.

And so, while we would push for and we would all encourage each other to perform above "meets;"

nevertheless, if someone has contributed to the success of an organization over the evaluation period, then there is -- and that's one of the reasons why you do have proportions. And so what happens is, you have perhaps a lower proportion that is provided to an employee who has met the objectives, because them meeting the objectives have contributed to the success of the organization for the previous year.
Obviously, someone who has performed and exceeds or more than meets level, will get the higher range of what you have indicated. And so, I just wanted to give that line of thought there, because it is my belief that anyone associated with the University, who is an employee, who has contributed to the success of the University over the evaluation period, is entitled to receive some element of bonus.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Thank you, Trustee Shannon. We are in a discussion phase.

TRUSTEE WOODY: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Trustee Woody.

TRUSTEE WOODY: I don't agree with that. Out of 36 years of evaluating -- a number of years, not the whole 36 -- evaluating employees and employees meeting standards, I never heard of them getting bonuses.

Every Trustee on this Board knows that there's been struggle back and forth between the President, either the President or the President and its administration and this board.

So I think we're contradicting ourselves or maybe fooling ourselves if we think that the situation is going to get any better. As far as a bonus, I give the President this credit: She has made an attempt to make vindication with me as a Trustee. I give her
credit for that. She came to Gainesville a couple of times. We laid out the red carpet treatment for the President.

But that does not negate the situation at hand. I'm going to consider myself as being one of the adopted ones. I didn't go to school at the University here at FAMU, but I have the responsibility -- I believe I have the responsibility to make sure that this University adheres to the greatness of the past, and I'm not so sure we're going in that direction.

So to give the President a bonus at this point, with all of the turmoil that is going on between the board and the President, I disagree with at this point.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Any additional comments, discussion phase, members of the Board?

Okay, I saw Trustee Washington and Trustee Warren.

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: So I am obviously a newby to the Board and it sounds like there was some ambiguity. I would just like to know if there was any sort of clear delineation when the performance metrics were aligned that meeting or exceeding would have an implication on the bonus or if that was something that was to be left to the board.
I am a forward teacher, so I am of the thought if one sets an expectation for one to -- or whoever is evaluating needs to let them know in advance what standards they need in order to receive that bonus or the grade. We don't give students a test and then later tell them they failed based on some arbitrary rubric we thought of ourselves. Or we should not. And so it is -- I would just like to know if there was -- if there was any conversation as to whether meeting a standard was not going to be good enough if we clearly aligned or made it known that exceeding or exceptional behavior is what was necessary to give a bonus.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Are you directing that question to me?

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: I'm directing it in general as a newby on the board.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Okay. So I don't recall a specific conversation addressing that particular area. I will stand corrected if someone on the board recalls that specific type of conversation.

You're pointing out a challenge -- not just with this contract but with other areas in how we conduct ourselves as a board. Nobody wants to have a public discussion about your problems, but in order for us to
get better, we have to talk about things like this and others that put us in a disadvantageous position.

We have fiduciary responsibilities in how we serve as a governing body. So with that said, to your question, I don't recall. I don't believe we had that conversation. It has been left to the Board and the question of the day, I think it has been framed is going to be, we're going to have to take a vote. It's required.

I think the question is going to be left with, based on having met versus having exceeded, what is the posture of the Board if we award a bonus based on an average performance or simply meeting; do we award a bonus based on exceeding? I think we can all agree we're not going to award a bonus based on failure to meet. I can't speak for everyone, but unless someone disagrees I think we can start there.

But there are three categories: failure; I think the Board agrees that unless someone objects that failure would warrant not receiving a bonus. Is there any objection to that?

Okay. The second category is meets, and then the third category is exceeds. Would anyone question if someone exceeded the category? Would anyone question giving a bonus if someone exceeded the category? And
if so, please speak up now. But I think we can walk
away that if you failed to meet the expectations you
would not receive; if you exceeded expectations you
would receive. So that leaves us where we are.

And Chairman of the Presidential Evaluation
Committee has stated that I think, what did you say?
What were the numbers?

TRUSTEE MOORE: Seven offered as a recommendation
meets, and five says did not meet.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: So in the one area that --
thank you, Trustee Moore -- in the one area that we're
legally bound by to consider with regard to this
action, there were seven that said expectations were
met; there were five that said expectations weren't
met. I'm sorry?

TRUSTEE MOORE: The only thing I would offer,
just to go back to Trustee Washington's point. I
think even though we have to make a decision today, I
think unless there is a language change, we're going
to be in the same spot next year because the language
in the contract does not speak to this amount of
exceeds and this is what will be looked at. So even
though we're trying to figure it out around this
table...

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: That's a good point.
Trustee Alston?

TRUSTEE ALSTON: Yes, Mr. Chair. Can I comment?

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Before you do so, just know ahead of time this will be coming to your committee with regard to the governance posture of the board. But please, please comment.

TRUSTEE ALSTON: Got it. And I'm traveling so if you hear background noise, my apologies.

The conversation focused on the language. I know the contract language today is different than the language we have seen in the past. And I know we see it as past for (inaudible) number. And I think a few of us may remember, a number that also included a range. So this document, I don't have it in front of me and at least the Board's flexibility on should there be a bonus, and if you have to receive it, what would be coming up with that number.

I think that posture is a little bit better than working before. But, of course, I agree with your comments and we'll be able to address your directives moving forward.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Thank you, Trustee Alston.

I have Trustee Warren next in cue.

TRUSTEE WARREN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Our decision-making here is a subjective decision by
design of the current contract. And before that, I
was going to give you this qualifier. I don't think
there is such a thing as an agreement that is void of
any ambiguity. So this one, being no different, when
you get two heads together -- and those two heads are
lawyers -- you're bound to end up about a document
that is reflective of one of the two or both.

And so, the result is a document that has some
ambiguity to it, and that's the fact of life. We do
have a juncture coming somewhere down the road where
we do have an opportunity to look at whether we extend
the contract to Dr. Mangum for another two year term.
And that's next year.

But for the moment, what we're talking about is
our subjective decision making, irrespective of if you
want to measure it by way of exceeds or did not exceed
or just met the goals. Do we want to provide a bonus
to Dr. Mangum, and that's a subjective decision that
we would make individually and the Board collectively.

And if we decide to do it, to what degree do we
want to provide a bonus? At 1 percent or 10 percent?
The contract says that we would not exceed 10 percent.
So even if we agree to provide, whatever your
subjective reasoning for doing it, it cannot exceed 10
percent of her gross.
But the motion that we're considering is not to do, and not to do it for whatever your reason is when you cast your vote. If you don't believe that there's a bonus -- that Dr. Mangum is deserving of a bonus, for whatever the reason might be, then vote no. It's really that simple.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Trustee Lawson, would you please restate the motion?

TRUSTEE LAWSON: The motion was to simply forfeit the bonus for this academic year.

TRUSTEE WARREN: Your motion is an affirmative vote, not to provide?

TRUSTEE LAWSON: Yes.

TRUSTEE WARREN: So it would be to vote "yes" for your motion?

TRUSTEE LAWSON: If you vote yes, you would by default agree with my motion, yes.

TRUSTEE WARREN: Thank you for clarification.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Is there any member that has not spoken that wishes to speak to this matter?

TRUSTEE WOODY: Question.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Motion has been stated. We'll take a roll call vote on this, Attorney Barge-Miles.

All those in favor please indicate -- I'm sorry.
We'll just do a roll call vote.

ATTORNEY BARGE-MILES: Trustee Alston?
TRUSTEE ALSTON: Yes.

ATTORNEY BARGE-MILES: Trustee Grable?
TRUSTEE GRABLE: No.

ATTORNEY BARGE-MILES: Trustee Graham?
TRUSTEE GRAHAM: Yes.

ATTORNEY BARGE-MILES: Trustee Lawson?
TRUSTEE LAWSON: Yes.

ATTORNEY BARGE-MILES: Trustee McWilliams?
TRUSTEE McWILLIAMS: Yes.

ATTORNEY BARGE-MILES: Trustee Montgomery?
CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Yes.

ATTORNEY BARGE-MILES: Trustee Moore?
TRUSTEE MOORE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Trustee Shannon?
TRUSTEE SHANNON: No.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Trustee Warren?
TRUSTEE WARREN: No.

ATTORNEY BARGE-MILES: Trustee Washington?
TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: No.

ATTORNEY BARGE-MILES: Trustee White?
TRUSTEE WHITE: No.

ATTORNEY BARGE-MILES: Trustee Woody?
TRUSTEE WOODY: Yes.
CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Trustee Grable?

TRUSTEE GRABLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I am very sorry. I need to -- at this point, am I allowed to change my vote?

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Your vote has not been closed. If you simply, with no discussion, share your vote.

TRUSTEE GRABLE: My vote should be yes to the motion.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Attorney Barge-Miles, what is the tally?

ATTORNEY BARGE-MILES: 8 yesses and 4 nos.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Okay. So by vote of eight to four, the motion passes.

Okay, any further discussion with regard to this agenda item?

TRUSTEE LAWSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Trustee Lawson, you're recognized.

TRUSTEE LAWSON: Thank you. You know, I just want to make one statement about the motion and I have another statement. I hope people understand that motion was not easy, because I'm sure there is a -- I know there is a lot of work that goes into the job of the presidency, but if we stay true to form in the
evaluation tool that was put together and what the results say, I think after those of who will reflect on that, you may or may not feel differently. But I just want to, on regard to say that.

But I think number two is a broad issue I would like to bring before the board, because I feel at times we, you know, may or may not address some of these issues head on and --

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: I'm sorry, Trustee Lawson.

Members who are in attendance, I'm hearing a lot of feedback. I'm asking you if you have additional discussions that take place, if you would please remove yourself from the room.

But as Chair, I'm hearing discussions so if you would please allow us to proceed with board business. If you could exit and have those conversations that would be most appreciative. Please continue.

TRUSTEE LAWSON: Yes. Thank you, sir. So I would bring to the table, I think broader, more challenging issue that just the way our meetings and our processes are put together, it's hard to figure out the right time for discussion. But Trustee Woody alluded to it and that is we had a discussion about performance review process about the relationship, the management of certain issues, and then I'm not going
to go into finite detail on what those issues were. Everybody remembers the conversation, I'm sure.

But I think as a board, we can't converse individually, but I do think we need to have a board discussion on where we stand with the President's performance. We went through the review, and it was very well-run and very well-organized, but however, to Trustee Warren's point earlier, we are close to rounding year three of a three-year contract and feels like it was not that long ago that the President joined us.

But at this point, I think there are clearly some concerns about where we are and where we're going. I was just made aware of some financial issues that came up that were a little surprising. I'm not going into those in detail, but I think we should as a Board, Mr. Chair, if you will allow me to open the discussions and see where we are.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: I'll allow it. Is there a motion?

TRUSTEE LAWSON: It's not a specific motion but I would like to see because I think given the way the Sunshine laws are put together, we don't have an opportunity to engage proactively in these discussions with each other. So what I would love to do is see
literally where we are.

We have had the review and we've had a year-plus of experience. We have our own set of concerns. And again, this is not a forum to litany those things out. It's not the way to handle this, in my opinion, but I would like to open a discussion about where we are from the standpoint of the longevity of this administration.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Okay. Being mindful of our invited guests, we will add it as an agenda items of discussion. We will ask for purposes of discussion that we get right to it. We have a packed agenda with our guest available, but Vice Chair Lawson, please proceed.

TRUSTEE LAWSON: That was my opening statement. I don't know if anyone else felt the same way as I. If no one else does then I'll consider the issue closed.

TRUSTEE SHANNON: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Okay, so I have Trustee Shannon, Trustee Moore, Trustee Grable. All right, in that order.

Trustee Shannon.

TRUSTEE SHANNON: I don't doubt we need to have the opportunity to have this discussion. I do have a
concern about having it now in the context of this agenda that we have built, because I think we very carefully built this agenda and have to preserve some time for the very important remaining agenda items of this course. And I would like to be able to, you know, one of things you said is that you just found out some information; well, the rest of the Board hasn't. And I think that if we're going to talk about it, that we do it in a context of the annual evaluation that we typically do.

Is that not coming up in a couple of months, time to do the evaluation? Or if we need to have it -- if it is important to have that conversation earlier, then other board members need to be made aware of points of information factual, in addition to being able to talk about our own experience and our own opinion.

I just don't think that type of conversation, I would not like for us to be rushed in that, and I don't think we have time in the remaining part of our meeting today to have the full discussion that we need to have.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: If you would, Trustee Lawson. We're a collective body. We currently have 12 members. And each member is entitled to his or her
opinion. There's a request for an agenda item that's
been stated. I granted the request.

    Trustee Shannon, duly noted. With regard to
point of information, I'm going to proceed to the next
Trustee, and I had Trustee Moore and Trustee Grable.

    TRUSTEE MOORE: My thoughts, certainly as you've
said, each trustee can offer up additional items;
however, for this strict agenda that's been laid out
that points to forward moving, and this is where we're
going and direction, I would very much challenge this
-- and I'm speaking for this collective body -- to go
off script with that.

    I think we have a mechanism in place where we've
talked about what those strategic goals and priorities
are that the body has had a chance to weigh in on. We
even talk about intervals by which we would review the
performance, the President's performance. It was my
understanding that we would be looking at that in
November, so it does provide a window of opportunity
to weigh in collectively on it.

    Again, I just believe at this juncture it would
take away from this great body that we pulled together
to convene to discuss a forward movement direction of
FAMU. I don't know if you want to do that today.

    CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Your comments are noted,
Trustee Moore.

Trustee Grable?

TRUSTEE GRABLE: I would have to disagree with the two previous Trustee's comments. I think it is a very appropriate time, all things considered, and considering the environment that we've had to deal with over these last few months. I think it is indeed an appropriate time for us to probably discuss that, in light of the discussion related to the bonus question that we just answered. So I would suggest that it probably is an appropriate discussion at this time.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: All right. Trustee Warren?

TRUSTEE WARREN: Mr. Chair we've spent the better part of the morning talking about synchronization; how we develop a plan with external and internal input that becomes the consensus, if you will, for a lot of people and how the University moves forward. It would be no and should be no confusion in the minds of the President from the University and Board members and staff, faculty, as to where we're going and who is responsible for leading us towards those objectives.

I would hate to see us spend the next few minutes making this effort somewhat moot. We put a lot of energy into this, in this convening, and we've shared
a lot today and hope there is more data to be gathered
and more information to be gathered in the outcome
from all of that information. Dr. Robinson and the
other committee will be a plan that we can all be
proud of, and we get to a point down the road where I
think I said earlier, you can't manage what you can't
measure. And as that strategic planning becomes the
tool by which we measure Dr. Mangum's performance.
And she doesn't run the University alone, and the
cohort that she has or collaboration that she would
have between staff and faculty to get to that
objective. If she fails us, it would be because of a
collective -- (inaudible) but they would not be
without a road map to see as an organization,
particularly as a Board, if we want to see this
University move.

And I would like to see us give her, her staff,
and faculty, the opportunity to make that all work.
So we have satisfied ourselves by way of the vote that
we made today that her performance to date does not
merit the awarding of a bonus.

Now, Dr. Mangum, faculty and staff, let's see you
work a new plan that we have contemplated today. It
is still to be tweaked some. There's more to be done,
but the leadership for that for the rest of the year
at the university and the highest of Seven Hills. Our prayer will be that you'll be successful with that, Dr. Mangum.

So I think for us to beat up, if you will, the past to be, at Dr. Mangum, or staff, or whoever it might be, at this very moment, is a waste of time.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Thank you for your comments.

Trustee Warren.

Sorry. Vice Chair Lawson?

TRUSTEE LAWSON: Yeah, you know I think that all of the trustees have had interesting perspectives.

TRUSTEE ALSTON: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Trustee Alston, I'll put you in cue.

TRUSTEE LAWSON: Where I was going, I think all of the trustees have had interesting perspectives, and my mode of operation is always to listen to determine if maybe an alternative point of view is appropriate.

However, we have all been living with this administration for quite some time. We all have our own points of view. We all have seen the view through our lense. We all have a responsibility as a board to properly manage the activities of the University. I think if you are in any other entity, if there were a
challenge with leadership, you would not wait until
November, would you not wait for Christmas; you would
take that appropriate time and that appropriate time
is dictated by the leadership in which we are.
I'm not advocating a specific action, but I'm
advocating an open discussion about where we are and
specifically where we're going. I think for us to
delay this would be somewhat remissed in our
responsibilities. I think we need to have this
discussion and try to keep it as a higher -- at a high
level, as much as we can, because I don't think
there's a need to go through finite details of
specific things, even though we can, but that's not
the objective. The objective is to determine where we
are and what direction do we take to move forward.
CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Trustee Alston.
TRUSTEE ALSTON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And I've
heard, I think I've heard most of the comments from my
colleagues. But one thing I'll say is -- and I do
agree, I'm okay with having a conversation today. I
will remind my colleagues, a year ago this time, there
was a separate conversation where I think I was public
when the president, at the time, made a staffing
decision, a year ago in time.
So my only comment would be I think that having
the discussion at this time, I think that is
appropriate and in order, but I think that, you know,
we go beyond that, that for me at this point, I just
don't know if today is the right timing. But I'll
defer to many of you on the board. That's my
perspective, you know, on how we should handle this.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Thank you. Trustee Graham?

TRUSTEE GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. If I may?

While I respect the opinion of every board member, I
think it would be best, yes, the conversation needs to
be had; all information needs to be provided, but we
have a panel with a sea of knowledge of those who sat
where she is today. And I think if the conversation
is going to be had today, that we should reserve it
for the end of the meeting, or at least after we hear
from former presidents on ideas, things that they did,
discussion and all of that, with respect to them in
their time as well.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Thank you, Trustee Graham.

Is there any member who has not spoken to this issue
that chooses to speak at this time?

Okay. We had an agenda item put forward by
Trustee Lawson, and you heard the discussions. You've
heard discussion suggestions from individual trustees.

Trustee Lawson, with regard to your agenda item, the
floor is yours.

   TRUSTEE LAWSON: Thank you. You know, it's
   amazing, Trustee Graham always has an interesting
   perspective. And I will say at this point, because we
   have the pleasure and the opportunity to hear from our
   former leaders, I would like to take that opportunity
   now. But I would like to bring this issue back for
   discussion prior to departing today.

   CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Members of the Board, if
   there's not objection, we'll move this agenda item to
   a time upon conclusion of hearing from our esteemed
   presidents. Is there any objection to that?

   TRUSTEE ALSTON: No objection.

   TRUSTEE WARREN: Mr. Chair, just to qualify, is
   it added to the agenda for discussion or action?

   CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Any action may be taken
   with regard to motions made by members of the board.
   If someone wants -- as chairman, I reserve the
   discretion to add agenda items so there's no
   restriction between what can be added to the end of
   the meeting.

   Does that answer your question?

   TRUSTEE WARREN: -- (Inaudible.) But more to
   Trustee Lawson about his intent.

   TRUSTEE LAWSON: Great question. I don't have a
motion, but I feel it is worthy of a discussion. We cannot communicate outside of these forums, and if we have issues that need to be discussed amongst the Board, this is the only venue. There may be a motion that comes, but right now I don't have a motion.

TRUSTEE WARREN: That satisfies my question.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Thank you. And with that, we are going to move that as an agenda item to the conclusion of the discussion with strategic planning and envisioning former presidents.

As I mentioned to you before, the meeting was requested by the former presidents. We have paired them into groups. We're asking each president, if they would limit their comments and discussion to 15 minutes. We have a timekeeper, our board liaison who has -- she's going to be our official timekeeper.

We're going to start with Dr. Larry Robinson and Dr. Walter Smith in the first hearing, and then we'll move into a question and answer session.

Dr. Larry Robinson.

FORMER PRESIDENT ROBINSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Members of the Board, President Mangum, and my esteemed former presidents, it's my pleasure to be here and talk for a few minutes. I'm probably not going to take a whole 15. Of course, you heard that
this morning, too.

I believe in the CV you sent us, Mr. Chairman,
you wanted us to talk about what was one of the most
significant things we did was most significant
challenges we faced including our tenure.

As President and Interim President, and this may
be a little bit difficult about what people thought
they were going to hear about, Trustee Shannon, as you
are probably one of those because you remember the --
hand-in-hand discussions we had with you and you
worked with us in fairly significant issues of the
day. But I thought the issue, when I looked at what
was happening across the HBCU landscape and back in
2012, '13 and '14, had more to do with the movement of
students into the university environment based upon
economic factors out in the world of federal funding.

That issue had to do with the changes made in
October 2011, to US Department of Energy's Current
Plus Loan program. I'm just going to read to you a
synopsis by United Negro College Fund and the impact
it was having across the community at that time.

And I quote, "The change in parent-plus, also
dramatically impacted HBCUs and also had to do with
the impact of students who needed federal funding,
subsidized loans generally. Students approved for
loans for the last two years -- and this was written early of this year -- In the 2012-2013 academic year alone, the number of students at HBCUs plus-loans dropped by 45 percent, or over 17,000 students across the community from the previous year. As a result, HBCUs lost $155 million in parent-plus loan funds; a 35 percent reduction already from already typed budgets, end quote.

So one of the things and the point I'm going to try and make sure is it doesn't matter what our internal struggles are, and what our strategic plan are, there are things that as leaders of this institution that are going on that you have to pay attention to.

And this is one of mine, right, that I was really, really concerned about. And I can't claim that I did anything alone to change this.

Mr. Chairman, I will point out to you that in addition to having personal conversations with Secretary of Education and meeting with him with a group of HBCU presidents, a small group, six to eight of us, along with our congressional representatives in Washington D.C. and this is -- it was represented to Corrine Brown.

We were able to change the direction the US
Department of Education had taken on this loan program such that October 23, 2014, it had run its course. Now, the change that they made wasn't warranted by any federal statute, a congressional statute. It was basically someone, in the spirit of accountability, changing the loan program where it went from -- and this may be oversimplifying it -- based upon the potential for the student to pay it back in the future, to bore the credit worthiness of the families. We're talking about families whose statuses are already challenging, and then say to them that, "You just don't get a shot at all unless your credit worthiness is at a certain level," and we just thought within the HBCU community that we had to collectively speak to make sure that the world understood where we were on this issue. And it was that collective voice, I believe, and all of us pausing from the many battles that we all have to do on a day-to-day basis to take the time and organize ourselves to speak to this issue. Because we were losing some students at this university and across the community as a whole; somewhere between six and ten percent was the average decline and student populations within HBCUs, and some of that is already turning around now that the new rules are in place.
So, of course, where this may not have been what some thought I would talk about, the point I'm trying to make here is, there are issues bigger than what we tend to deal with on a day-to-day basis. Those national issues that we talked about, we have to pay attention to in our strategic planning. We have to keep our eyes on those.

And beyond that, we have to leverage our collective resources, political and otherwise, to make it clear to others that the things that they do have an impact on what we do at this institution. And what we do at this institution has a great impact on the state of Florida and the nation.

So I just wanted to use my three minutes, Mr. Chairman, to really talk about how, what you see here and these fine individuals, and Dr. Mangum, are people who have to pay attention to local, state, national, international issues, because that's where you're speaking now, somebody is changing something or formulating something that we're going to have to pay attention to because it will affect us in the end.

So I'm pretty sure each one of these presidents can give a similar story about what that was when they sat in the seat. This just happened to be one of the ones that I thought was worthy of our attention. And
I'll briefly mention while we were sitting here, not that we weren't busy otherwise, there were a lot of other things changing from the federal perspective, that now has an impact on students attending this University; not just a loan issue, but the score card ranking or rating system that has been utilized and so forth.

So while we deal with these issues that are important on a local basis, we really have to test as well for the intentions happening on a national level as well.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: And Dr. Robinson, you are first: Solutions and recommendations in regard to the challenges that you propose.

FORMER PRESIDENT ROBINSON: Yeah. So you have to be engaged and aware of what's happening on a national level. In fact, as Dr. Lewis can tell you, as a former Dean, you know, you really have to get out to watch and influence what's coming, so there's a way -- we used to talk about this all the time.

You can wait for the National Institute's help, the National Science Foundation, Property of Energy, to put on the street the next solicitation for research funding, right? Or, you can go to Washington and make sure they put on the streets what is relevant
to your mission and those opportunities that your faculty will have an opportunity to be competitive, okay?

You can't just sit and wait, okay? And the other one is, is that we have to work as a community, right? We have to work as a community, take advantage of the political resources that we have locally and nationally, to address these problems. But also, we have to expand beyond just the community of people who have gone to Florida A&M University, other HBCUs, for example.

I'll give you one more example of how this is important and I'll sit down. In 1997, the Department of Commerce requested a meeting with HBCU presidents to talk about how we could allow the proper commerce and one of its major agencies, access to the talent that we had on our campuses. So Dr. Humphries was kind enough to allow me to represent the University in that meeting that occurred in that Commerce.

We had also eight or nine other HBCUs at the time and we actually confirmed a consortium, the HBCU Consortium. The ultimate result of that is that about four years later, we had convinced the US Congress to put on the street another $15 million program and know that we were able to compete for it and when. And
this is the largest grant, by the way, on FAMU's campus today.

So first of all, paying attention to what happens nationally, we could have done it ourselves at FAMU but we took our colleagues in Texas, Atlanta, North Carolina, Delaware, North Carolina, and looked at our political delegation as a whole, right? Not just a montra we had at FAMU. We had some movers at FAMU because, we had one in particular that was on the House and Appropriation Committee, so that gives you a lot of weight. But we looked at our collective political weight, and we didn't ask for any.

We said, "We have something to offer you. You have been missing out on this. Let us help you." So anyways, that collective working together as a group, leveling our resources that created what many are calling the most successful work force programs in the federal sector.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Thank you, Dr. Robinson. We'll hear from Dr. Smith and we'll move to a collective Q and A with the two. Thank you.

Dr. Walter Smith.

FORMER PRESIDENT SMITH: Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, my colleagues, it's too bad that you
wouldn't put Dr. Humphries and me up here at the same
time, so I can look up at him and he down at me as we
talk about some things that happened sequentially. We
are forever arguing and fussing, but we love each
other, and we've supported each other over the years.

Dr. Robinson mentioned some things that I will
not duplicate. There's no point in me going back and
saying some of the same things that he said, but let
me tell you just a little bit about the way we changed
FAMU in a very critical period, and I think in some
ways you're facing some of the same things today.
Maybe not identically the same items, but change.

As President Elmira knows, I was at the Board of
Trustee's meeting in Gainesville -- I mean, the Board
of Governor's meeting in Gainesville, and as I sat
there listening to some of the things that were said
by some people I really wanted to fight, but I just
had to sit there and listen. And I say that not
jokingly, seriously, because there are still people
out there who feel that Florida A&M University is an
inferior institution rather than one of the best.

Now, you might not believe it, but it's true.
You heard some of the comments that were made at the
Board of Governor's meeting. That would infuriate you
and this didn't just begin.
Back at the time that I became president, Dr. Bill Perry, Jr., who preceded me, went through some very difficult times and some of you who are in this room know something about the difficulties that he faced. And when I became president, I had the good sense to do what every succeeding president should have the good sense to do, and that is I sat with Dr. Perry and asked questions about some of the things that he thought needed to be priorities at the University; what needed to be upgraded from his perspective; who some of the people were in the Florida Legislature, in the community, who were strongly supportive of FAMU; strongly opposed to FAMU.

Now, we're talking about the '70s now. But don't fool yourself; in some ways, we're still in the '70s, and even the '60s in some instances. That means we have a lot of hard work to do, meaning, we have got to be united as a part of Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University.

I'll give you some examples of what I'm talking about. When I became president in 1977, there was some concern that our nursing school would be closed. There were some problems, and if you can just imagine walking up to the top floor of Jackson Davis Hall and finding that as a clinical spot for nursing, wow. It
needed to be changed.

Our nursing students were having to go all the way to Jacksonville and other areas to get their recs. I recognize that came early; came in and the battles to change that, and I'm showing these things to you because you will find things that you have to change.

Dr. Humphries had to change some things when he came, but presidents before you will have started some things that haven't been finished. So what do we do? We built after hard fighting, and I'm saying hard fighting because we had to go to the Legislature and fight. We had to challenge the Board of Regions.

Yes, we have a Board of Trustees today and a Board of Governors, but there might come a time when the President, with the proper strategic plan, will have to win the Board of Trustees, and the President with the Board of Trustees will have to win the Board of Governors, in order to get the things that are needed for Florida A&M University.

You've got to have the inputs to do that. And you know what? We went to the Joint Resolution Committee of the Florida Legislature and asked for permission to make a presentation when they were trying to get the budget done and agreement between the House and the Senate. They brought the Chancellor
there. The Chancellor made his comments and I made mine, and instead of walking away with $3 million, we walked away with $13.5 million. And guess what? The School of Nursing building, Part 1 that you see now and then you have Allied Health that came during Humphries's years, attached to it.

The frontal part of the School of Business and Industry was a part of that. The other part came and Dr. Humphries's years. And you know what? The next thing was? Stadium. Why that? Because we didn't like the rejection that had taken place by NCAA of our athletic program.

As I look around you, I know Dr. McWilliams knows what I'm talking about, and some others. And you know what we did? We got on a plane and flew to Dallas, Texas, and challenged the Classification Committee of the NCAA. What happened? The Tallahassee Democrat had to hide its head under a bundle because it had already laughed about what wouldn't happen. We came back and it happened. Florida A&M University was Division 1, Double A, and won that first national championship. But it took fighting.

And I can go down the line, but it would take time beyond what Chairman Montgomery has given us, even though Dr. Robinson has done a fantastic job.
But one of the things we have to always remember is where there is a shortage of us -- and when I say "us," I'm talking about African-Americans and others who look just like us, and there's a need for them. We had no School of Allied Health at that time, but there was a need for people, and physical therapy, health care management, and right on down the line. And you know what? We had to fight to get it, because there were other institutions in our system who opposed us. That's something you have to watch. Positions that other institutions in the system will take that will not be what you want to see happen, and you have to fight for what you want and what you need. And we got the School of Allied Health.

One of the great discussions you have today is with the FAMU/FSU College of Engineering. Those of you who don't remember it -- and I always look at Dr. McWilliams because he and I always talked. Our sister or brother institutions across the track really didn't want us to have that school, because it had one once before and it closed. We had to fight but we had something that could be worked with to get us to where we needed to go.

We had a School of Technology that had
foundational programs that could help build a College of Engineering. And after we fought with the help of people both at the Florida Legislature, and believe it or not, the Congress of the United States, I went all the way to Washington, with the help of the late Don Fuquay, and testified in the House of Representatives about the need for more African-Americans in engineering and technology. That's helped us. That helped us greatly. And you know what? As a result of that we got engaged with the Office of Civil Rights, and the concept of unnecessary duplication arose and we ended up winning our battle and getting the College of Engineering.

Yes, we started as an Institute of Engineering but it was fundamentally the same thing. The key thing is we had programs that would provide the opportunity for the production of more African-American engineers, something we needed very badly.

Well, we could go on and on with programs, but one of the things in my mind that is very important, and that is, you must not only use what you have in the Florida Legislature and what you have on campus, but you've got to use those of us who graduated from Florida A&M University to work with you. Because, you
know what? Florida A&M University provided the foundation for us to get to where we are.

Tommy Mitchell, I saw him. There he is. He played for the Harlem Globetrotters. But you know what? He didn't start with the Harlem Globetrotters. FAMU provided him to become a Harlem Globetrotter. We can go around this room and name two or three of them. One of the best directors of dietetic concepts in a hospital in the State of Florida is sitting right here, Dr. Carolyn Collins, a graduate of Florida A&M University.

What I'm saying to you is, don't assume that because you've been somewhere other than FAMU, or you've worked with some institution other than FAMU, that you can use that to build the kind of institution we need and is required to meet the needs of our community and our state, our nation, and the international scene. Take what you have and make what you want.

And I'm going to close by saying this: We did it in a lot of ways. School of journalism; I don't have to tell you, you know some of the graduates in journalism; allied health, nursing, engineering, and one school that was closed. And I know my friend would like to hit me -- don't you hit me when I talk
about it -- general studies.

I'm not talking about Dr. Humphries y'all. We started general studies at a time that was critical. Yes, things change, but you know what? As we look at the downfall of enrollment, take another look. It might be something that we need to meet some of the needs. And yes, we have a community college system, we have a great articulation concept, but that does not mean that we cannot get more students in the Florida A&M University when we can give them the kind of guidance and counseling they need for other mobility and we have to do that. The time we've got to -- we've got to -- that is the thing to tell me to shut up? Well, he gave me some minutes, so I got some left.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Doctor, I'm just going to ask you adhere to the limit. We need to stay on time. We're going to move to question and answer, and at that time, you'll be able to respond. If you'll allow us, the time has expired. We're going to move to questions.

FORMER PRESIDENT SMITH: I'll sit down and shut up.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: No, please remain, and we'll move to Q and A from the Board.
FORMER PRESIDENT SMITH: And the topic is international education.
Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Dr. Robinson only made it by two minutes now. But with that said, gentlemen, as we proceed with our strategic planning process and visioning of the Board, Dr. Smith, I heard you talk about General Studies. I think collectively it would be helpful to hear recommendations with regard to successes you had or saw, or how they could be potentially applicable to today. But as we proceed, I'll move to questions, concerns, comments, members of the Board.

I saw Trustee Moore's hand and then Trustee Grable.

TRUSTEE MOORE: This question is directed to Former President Larry Robinson. Relative to engagement, the same city of the homework of your tenure and my exposure to having you on the Board, talk about how you were able to engage at all of the different levels and stakeholders. It's not an easy process, but it's one that is critical.

FORMER PRESIDENT ROBINSON: I didn't have any reservations about talking to anybody or listening to anybody, because I entered into this by fully being
aware that I don't know anything. I certainly don't
know everything, but I can learn from anybody. And
so, when I sat down to figure out how to do this job,
I had the benefit of all of these individuals who came
before me, but at the same time, I knew that out there
among the masses was somebody with potentially a
better idea.

And I don't assume that I'm smarter than anybody.
In fact, one person in all of my career asked me what
was my philosophy with regard to teaching, and that
individual sits here to my right, and I don't think he
thought I was ready to answer that. I was being
interviewed for the Provost position at the time in
2003 and he thought he caught me, right?

My response to that was that when I engaged in a
classroom setting, I assumed that if I learned that
anybody can, right, and if the students aren't getting
it, I should be figuring out what am I doing wrong,
right? So I need to figure out a way to get down to
where they are, because if I figure out that they --
and so when it came to possibilities with regard to
how to run this very complex place.

This is a very complex place. You have some
ideas of your own, vision of your own and some, but at
the same time respecting that there are people from
the Board of Trustees, the leadership team, to the
lady needing help getting into the stands, who will
provide you some valuable lesson on how to do a better
job at being a President of Florida A&M University.
And I really mean that, you know, with all sincerity.

TRUSTEE MOORE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Trustee Grable.

TRUSTEE GRABLE: This question is for both the
former president and interim president. I would like
to hear your most significant thoughts about the
FAMU-FSU Joint College of Engineering.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Dr. Smith, go first.

FORMER PRESIDENT SMITH: Gosh, somebody called me
when you did. I'm sorry about that.

I wrote a letter when that happened, that some of
you might have seen and you might not have seen. My
letter was to have the Dean understand that if indeed
he was responsible to the President of FAMU, that's
the way he was to function.

More importantly, it's important for them to
understand broadly that the College of Engineering was
established to serve both institutions broadly. Now,
if I had my way, the Legislature appropriations would
be different -- and I don't want to talk about that
now because that would take time, but I'm going to say
this. I think that the president has to maintain a
strong hand in working with the Dean of the College of
Engineering. And if it's necessary for both
presidents to sit down so that the other president
understands that the Dean is responsible to the
President of FAMU, then it ought to happen.

The college, the FAMU-FSU College of Engineering,
is very vital to our community, and all you have to do
is look at the productivity from baccalaureate to PhD.
Now, as I stand before you, I can smile; some of you
know it. My son, Walter, who is a civil engineer, is
a graduate of that College of Engineering. My
grandson, Jonathan Smith, is a graduate of our College
of Engineering; is now completing his masters degree
in computer science at FAMU. And you know something?
When you saw -- what do you call that little thing
that was flying around -- the drone -- I'm getting old
you know, the drone flying around? Jonathan knows how
to build them, and he learned at the FAMU-FSU College
of Engineering, all right?

So we're talking about a component of FAMU -- I
emphasize that -- a component of FAMU that provides
the opportunity for our young people to reach out into
areas that some years ago they could not reach out
into because they were not exposed to it.
And I think that means one thing. I'm going to say it like I feel: This Board of Trustees, our President, and if necessary coupled with our alumni and other supporters must not bend your knees. You've got to stand straight, stand tall, and tackle the problems that you face as we maintain the FAMU-FSU College of Engineering. I hope I answered your question.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Dr. Robinson.

FORMER PRESIDENT ROBINSON: I don't think I can talk that long, but I will say this. I remember as Provost, coming on board in 2003, Dr. Gainous was going through an accreditation cycle at that time. And the accrediting body, ABET, meets at both campuses for FSU and FAMU. And I remember when they came to us in the words of -- well, I can't repeat those, but anyways, some things had been said and the conversation was over how could we have these questions now we're programmed and at one time what was modeled for the nation in collaboration between Historical Black Colleges and predominant white institutions.

I saw so much potential in that, right, because in the back of my mind, even more so now than then, I just didn't think it could be done because we created
high tech, but I just didn't know if we would ever
have two separate fully-functioning engineering
schools in the city of Tallahassee. I just don't know
if that would happen. But anything is possible.
Anything is possible.

So I thought the model we had -- in fact, we
have -- is a model where both institutions can be
successful, okay? But I think for FAMU and the State
of Florida, it's critically important because what we
were doing, and you know we have a lot of discussions
about the program that's appropriate. With what we
have been doing over the years and many other programs
that are appropriate, we're diversifying the work
place into which they go.

And remember the primary criteria for
establishing a degree program, number one is mission;
number two is, you know, need and demand for
individuals in that particular profession. And we
know the demand is high for engineering, is probably
going to be high. There's going to be fluctuation
from time to time, and we need people from diverse
backgrounds to populate the work force in engineering
in the state of Florida and really around the nation.

And I think FAMU has done a fabulous job in doing
that, and we need to make sure that we intend to be
able to do that over the future. Because as the emphasis of STEM is getting greater and greater, and the expectations for that are greater and greater, we just have to be there, and helping them make this school go as productive as it can be and producing a diverse engineering work force. Because that's what the corporate sector really wants to see at FAMU and other HBCUs.

FORMER PRESIDENT HUMPHRIES: You know, this is an important topic, and there have been several of us involved with the Joint College of Engineering and if we wait until our turns, it's going to be disjointed, right? I mean, Ammons has a tour, and then I have a most wonderful tour in there, and if you wait for me and I'm last, y'all are going to be tired.

On this topic, I would like to add to the conversation, while it's fresh on your mind, hearing Walter and hearing Robinson. So if you don't mind, this is a little deviation that Ammons can talk to. He came out to me, but maybe I should talk before Ammons, but if it's all right.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: I would ask one thing, Dr. Humphries. If you would come to the podium, we'll make the adjustment, we're flexible. We appreciate -- Dr. Humphries doesn't like being told what to do,
but this is my opportunity.

FORMER PRESIDENT HUMPHRIES: I followed Walter as
President, and I had to deal with the joint college in
its embryo stage, and I share the same thoughts he
had; that having a Joint College of Engineering was an
important thing to do. Now, why?

All of the great institutions of higher education
will have four disciplines. It will have four. You
can look at all of the great ones -- except for
specialized school. MIT is a specialized school.
Harvard has those four programs, and I'll tell you
what they are: They're business, they're engineering,
a strong College of Arts and Sciences -- and I'm like
Perry from Texas now, I forgot the fourth one.

Did I say the medical school? The medical
school. That's the 4th one. And I set out doing that
to have, because from my study of higher education at
those institutions; that's why FSU wants to have an
engineering school all to its own, because they have
the medical school, they have the -- well, the rest of
them had. I'm getting old, too, Walter. Okay?

So I fought to have a presence, and if you want
to know how the budget got to FAMU, this is how it got
to FAMU. When I came on board, the Alumni of FAMU
said we don't have a role in the Joint College of
Engineering. We had 57 students enrolled, but you couldn't see much of FAMU in it, and as I went around the state speaking to the alumni, what they said was that, you know, "Is the Joint College of Engineering a farce? Is FAMU a part of it?"

And so, I tried to figure out how do I do something that will convince our alumni that we are indeed a part of the Joint College of Engineering. Now, there was an unresolved problem. The unresolved problem was where to locate the buildings for the engineering school. They had a $14 million funding to build an engineering program. So Bernie Sneider and I got together over drinks at the Double Tree, downtown Tallahassee. And Charley Reid, who was the Chancellor, and McArthur who was a nice Chancellor for Administration, and they were bugging us about making a determination of where you're going to locate the school.

So Bernie and I went downtown in the evening and he said, "I need to locate the engineering school in Innovation Park." He said, "The white business community is on me about locating it in Innovation Park."

And I told him, "My black alumni is on me about having something that I can tell them that would as
sure them that we were indeed a credible partner in
the Joint College of Engineering." And I said, "I
need the budget," because at that time the budget was
going one year to FAMU and one year to FSU.

And I said, "I want the budget. You put the
budget at FAMU, and I think all of us understand you
having the budget." And so he says, "Fine. You can
have the budget," and I said, "You can have the
location of the engineering school in Innovation Park,
right?"

So we called Charlie and told him that we were
going to have a meeting, and we went out there and met
with he and McArthur and Charlie Reid. And we told
Charlie we solved the problem, so he said, "What did
you do?" And I said, "FSU is going to get satisfied.
We're going to put the engineering school out there at
Innovation Park, and the budget is going to FAMU," and
both of them looked at Bernie Sneider and said, "Are
you really willing to let FAMU have the budget for the
joint College of Engineering?" And he said, "Yeah,
I'm willing to do that."

And so we got the budget, they got the building
location out there and it went on.

Now, as soon as Sandy Dellenberg became president
of FSU, he started asking for the budget and Thrasher
for many years had called a Chancellor at the Board of
Regions to say, "Put the budget administratively back
at FSU." So this is not a new issue. They've been
through the years -- almost the whole time I was
president -- trying to get that budget from FAMU, and
finally on one Saturday morning when we were meeting
out at this College of Engineering, I told Sandy
Dellenberg, if he didn't stop asking me and trying to
take the budget, that the only way he could get it is
over my dead body, because I was going to whoop his
ass for bothering.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: We're going to leave that
off of the transcript.

FORMER PRESIDENT HUMPHRIES: And stopped at that
point, but the budget was very important and because
we controlled it, and there are a lot of reasons for
that; I won't go into that. But here are some of the
accomplishments, right? We are number one in the
nation in the production of African-Americans with
degrees in engineering. We beat Georgia Tech, North
Carolina A&T; all of those schools had engineering
schools much longer. But together, we produced 165
African-American baccalaureate degrees in engineering.
That was number one in the nation.

By ourselves, we were number two. We had 140
baccalaureate degrees in engineering coming from the FAMU side; 25 came from FSU, so the joint college together became number one in the nation. We were always in the Top 5 in terms of the production. And so we had a model for the nation of how you can produce African-American engineers.

But now, what made -- what makes this relationship so important? The whole time I was president, I fought to get PhDs in the STEM field. I fought to get a PhD in chemistry, biology, mathematics, computer science. I fought to get PhDs in all of the engineering disciplines.

FAMU -- and make no mistake about this, if we had an independent college, you're never get a PhD in the STEM fields, but because we were together and because we were peculiar together, with FSU, we got all of the PhDs in engineering. FAMU today produces PhDs in engineering degrees.

The unfinished business of Florida A&M in the STEM field is getting -- the Board authorized us, the Board of Regions authorized us and approved us to get PhDs in addition to all of the engineering fields, to get PhDs in mathematics, chemistry, biology, computer science, African-American studies, PhD in entomology, Physics PhD. The only one that we got was the PhD in
physics, and so still is the PhD in chemistry, in biology, mathematics, African-American studies, and computer science.

Now why is that important? I mean, every now and then I look at social media, Facebook, and people talk about the classification of FAMU; what classification will it be; how does it stack up against the classification of the other institution.

Well, if we had all of our degrees that we're entitled to, PhDs, we move into a whole new classification. We'll be classified to equally, and what we have to do to get up there is to produce 50 PhDs at graduation. If we do that, we'll have the same classification as FSU.

They talking about they want to be in the top 25; hell, we have a claim for the top 25, too, because we would have the Carnegie classification, the same as theirs. And so, holding on to the joint College of Engineering has important consequences for the development of FAMU. If you lose the Joint College of Engineering and it goes solely to FSU, what you're going to have is we're going to drop, because the Board of Governors is going to see to that, because they're already talking about taking away the PhDs from FAMU, so you can't let them take away the PhDs.
CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: All right.

I can speak for the Board, I don't know of any Board member who has the posture that the school should be taken away or closed or solely given way. We appreciate the comments, and I'm trying to work on equal time here and moving it around.

FORMER PRESIDENT HUMPHRIES: I'm through.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: But my question to you, before you leave, because we're going to come to you, is I thought I heard a recommendation of the 50 PhDs, but what specifically are you recommending to the Board in forms of suggestions or recommendations?

FORMER PRESIDENT HUMPHRIES: My suggestion is, the other thing, is first of all y'all should read the report that $500,000 was paid for to have a say-so about the Joint College of Engineering. That report tells you all of the people they paid. They recommended that the budget stay at FAMU and that you keep the Joint College of Engineering and they gave all of the reasons why you should do that.

So you have a report that's presented to the Board of Governors and the Governor, which says they are doing exactly what the report said they shouldn't do, all right? So that report is important, and it should be made available to every member of the Board
and you should read it with regard to that.

So number one, I'm saying hold on to the Joint College, fight to get that budget back, all right, and then you've got to pay special attention to it. You can't just say, "We have the Joint College of Engineering back." No. Then you have to work to make the Joint College of Engineering to be a benefit of FAMU and that means you've got to pay special attention to recruiting, getting scholarship dollars, making sure that grants are written that will get money to undergird and support scholarships for engineering students.

One of the high achievements of the College of Engineering is that one year we had five national science foundation scholars. We had more National Science Foundation fellows than the whole state put together. FSU had one, Florida had two, and Miami had had one. We had five, all right? Five of the best kids coming out in engineering in the country. The whole state only had four; we had five, and, I mean, those kids out-performed the kids that we recruited for engineering, out-performed everyone. I mean, the Dean came over and told me, Dean Champ, he said, "FAMU is recruiting so many black engineers it looks like North Carolina A&T over
there."

Well, that's where we have to go back to. And
you have to have -- I'm making a recommendation --
that it ain't enough to note. You have to set a
strategy, develop a plan, for how you're going to keep
the image of FAMU high in a joint college, and how
it's going to be an intricate part of the Joint
College, and how you're going to get out there and
recruit the kids so that you can increase the growth
of the student studying for engineering.

And make no question about it, to produce
engineers is a big thing, right? Petroleum engineers
start with $110,000 now. And chemical engineers right
behind them; they're at $95,000. So we need to just
-- just like we produce all of those people in
pharmacy and they go out there with over a hundred
thousand dollar starting salary, and went to business
school and when they get their MBA and they go out and
start making ninety to a hundred thousand dollars.

The reason why FAMU people are so arrogant is
because they make more money than the average black
college graduate, because they've got all of these
good fields they can major in that pays them well.
But you don't want to lose engineering; engineering is
one of the highest paid disciplines we can produce.
So that’s my recommendation: Get back to the basics with the Joint College of Engineering. Put some money into the recruitment of students, and put somebody who is physically identified and reports to President Mangum on exactly what kind of progress is being made in increasing the presence of the University in the Joint College of Engineering.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Thank you, Dr. Humphries. Dr. Ammons, do you want to weigh in on the engineering school, or do you want to wait for your time to address it then. We know you’re coming behind Dr. Humphries and your his Provost.

FORMER PRESIDENT AMMONS: Dr. Humphries said a great deal, and he pretty much said it. I was there along with him as Provost and then as President as we developed these academic programs in the College of Engineering and insure that those programs were on the inventory at Florida A&M University as well, because we had the capacity to go out and recruit the best and the brightest students to the College of Engineering.

The other piece that I would say is that I was there when the deal was cut on where the budget would be, and so before I came to be President of Florida A&M, in the spring of 2007, I got a call that there was a run being made to take the budget from
Florida A&M and move it to Florida State. Well, of course I knew the significance of that move, and it was already teed up in legislation. It had moved through the Legislature and was being in the Appropriations Committee. Well, it just so happened that one of my former students was a chair of the House of Appropriations Committee. And so, I rushed down from North Carolina to Tallahassee, and I went and met with them and a commitment was made. The budget would stay at Florida A&M University because he understood the importance of the budget being at Florida A&M, and so the budget remained. And it is a significant, very significant indicator of FAMU's participation in the College of Engineering, and its presence. And there were some other things that were attached to the budget. There were also administrative functions that were also attached that gave FAMU a presence in the College of Engineering. So that's my piece and I'll talk when it's my turn.

FORMER PRESIDENT SMITH: May I say one thing?
CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Your time is back on. You and Dr. Robinson, y'all are back up.
FORMER PRESIDENT SMITH: I didn't want to stand up and talk anymore. I wanted to say one thing, that Dr. Ammons mentioned the importance of being willing to face the Joint Resolution Committee of the Legislature.

The importance of being willing to face that Joint Resolution Committee is important, because you get a budget that does not meet your requirements from your perspective, and if you let it go as it is settled when it gets there, then you don't get the resources you need. I think that's very important what he's saying, because many of the things that we did as we were going through developmental areas and stages of FAMU during some tough times was just that. I had to face them four times, but you cannot be afraid to face them, and that's very important. And I say that because you have a Board of Governors above you, and sometimes you have to confront them in a way that's meaningful for the institution of which you preside.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Is there any of you that would have voted for the change of the budget? By a show of hands? Anybody? Dr. Robinson?

FORMER PRESIDENT ROBINSON: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a slight correction to Dr. Humphries's
remarks, and whenever I do something like this I say I enjoy my job here at the University. One of the toughest proposals that I ever wrote actually was the proposal in 1998 that resulted in the PhD program in Environmental Sciences in 1999.

Before it all, and Dr. Ammons was Provost at the time, that didn't exactly give it to us. We had to give compelling argument -- as strong as any argument I've made for any research grant of my career -- and it was still tough, right? But the important thing about the graduate and professional programs at FAMU is that in the last 20 years, with the exception of educational leadership, all of them have been in the STEM and/or Allied Health disciplines.

We just celebrated -- as Dr. Henry or Dr. Lewis can attest -- the 20 years of the Institute of Public Health. You know, I had the pleasure of going with the director, Dr. Cynthia Harris, to the Board of Regions to seek and attain approval of the doctorate, the DRPH program.

I also had the pleasure in the snapshot of time I was their interim president or CEO, in 2007, to insure that we got the doctorate of Physical Therapy and DPT back on this board's agenda, because the discipline was changing; such the talking about the grade was
born to be DPT. And so FAMU has made some very wise
decisions in terms of where it has grown on the post-
baccalaureate level.

You know, from pharmacy to start with and the PhD
programs and physics and environmental sciences,
gineering, all of these have characterized us as the
types of institutions and environments that you want
to be. And I just want to remind everyone that the
very part of the strategic planning process is the
degree programs that we plan for over the life of that
strategic planning.

So we're going to have to think about this very
seriously as we develop the strategic planning. All
right? But anyways, I just want to mention that I
think it happened so fast that Dr. Humphries forgets
about it.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Members of the Board, I do
want to allow an opportunity to any questions for
Dr. Robinson and Dr. Smith.

Members of the Board?

Trustee Shannon.

TRUSTEE SHANNON: Yes. I listened with interest
with all that you had to share so, thank you, and I
took a lot of notes. This question is not to minimize
that very important information that you gave, but I
do want to ask you: From your position of President, what was your most significant challenge with your governing board, whatever format that was in at the time you were President? What was your most significant challenge with board relations, and what did you do to overcome those challenges?

We probably only have time to talk about your most significant one.

DR. ROBINSON: Okay, let me go first. The one thing, I will say this. One thing, I am quick to realize is that the demand for knowing by this governing body, was such that I had to pay particular attention to making sure that they knew what I was doing. And in many cases, trying to anticipate what was going to happen next.

So we developed a very elaborate communication program. And I see Attorney Barge-Miles sitting back there. I mean, if somebody stubbed their toe, fell down on the football field practicing, you know, you probably heard about it, right? And my goal was Trustee Shannon, can I get it to the Board before they read about it in the Tallahassee Democrat, right? There were times that I couldn't beat, the bloggers are quick to the facts, right?

So making sure that I kept the board informed as
a governing body was one of my biggest talents, okay?
And I can't tell you about a particular, but it was --
so I spend a lot of time communicating via through
e-mail, through the phone with many people who are
still here around the table; all in interest in making
sure that you and I are not blindsided, to the extent
that I could. That was my biggest challenge, because
while I was doing that, I still had to worry about
Parent Plus loan, and some other things we were
working on trying to get right with SACs and so forth.
Those things continue.

But I had to spend a lot of time -- and I enjoyed
every minute of it -- of keeping the Board informed.

That was my biggest --

FORMER PRESIDENT LEWIS: May I address that? I
happened to serve as the interim president when this
board was first established and I had the pleasure of
working with Avery McKnight, and then general
counsel -- I forgot his name -- in trying to craft the
relationship between the staff. And I was the staff
to you, and we had some healthy discussions, if you
remember, about that, about what the role of the staff
was and what the role of the Board is and should be in
that regard.

I was fresh off of being County Commissioner here
in Tallahassee, and I knew very well a relationship between the board and my staff, in that regard. And I tried to bring that kind of structure to this Board. We had some knock-down, drag-outs with legal counsel, quite frankly, about what that role should be, and I see you're still struggling 13 years later with that. So Mr. Chairman, one of the things -- I'm going to talk a little bit about that with my prescribed time, but certainly how can we better improve what the roles of staff and Board is, and how that communication system works that Dr. Robinson just alluded to. And I have some comments that I will leave with you, but 13 years was a long time ago if we're talking about the same thing.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Thank you, Dr. Lewis.

Hold on. Dr. Smith?

FORMER PRESIDENT SMITH: You know, I realize that it's quite different now in terms of the structure with you being the Board of Trustees, working with the President on a daily basis in a sense, and the one that we had to deal with was the Board of Regions, and I had to deal with. And it could take awhile for me to tell you all of the stuff I went through with the Board of Regions, because there were so many people who wanted to see FAMU remain where it was, or, if
anything could go down.

My goal when I gave my address that there were 19 critical points that I wanted to see accomplished at FAMU. And we did that. Notice I said "we" did it. I didn't say "I." We did it. But got to the 19th and there was the 20th. That 20th was to get our first PhD program. And as I look at Dr. McWilliams, I know he remembers that because of the fight.

There was strong opposition to Florida A&M University having a doctoral program; a PhD in any category -- in any category -- in spite of some of the great research we were doing and the outcome of some of it.

We fought, we fought, we fought, and we got the PhD program. Fortunately, for Dr. Humphries, he was able to award the first recipient of the PhD program, but one of the things that we fought with continuously was maintaining FAMU upward mobility.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Dr. Smith, if you allow me just a moment. For clarity's sake, the dynamics are different. I appreciate the question, but the dynamics of a FAMU President standing for all of FAMU with a Board of Governors -- excuse me, with a Board of Regions, and the dynamics of presenting to its Board of Trustees with its different mission, versus
say, a Board of Regions for the entire system, the
dynamics are different.

So I understand there was a fight, fight, fight,
and a challenge. But back to your question, that's a
different fight. The President now doesn't go and
have a "fight, fight" with a Board of Governors. The
President works with the Board of Trustees or is
supposed to work with the Board of Trustees. The
Board of Trustees is then an advocate on behalf of the
institution, because whereas before the President
represented the institution, the President now works
for a Board of Trustees and the Board of Trustees
presents the advocacy function into the system
governing body.

And so, I just want to be clear that we're not in
a "fighting" capacity. The President doesn't have to
fight the Board of Trustees for FAMU, like they did
when you were in office. So I do want to make sure
the question is answered, but it's a different
governing body dynamic now, and I want to make sure
that's relevant in terms to the question.

FORMER PRESIDENT SMITH: But when you're asked a
question, what was -- I should say, what were some of
the more significant, I want to tell you one that
stood out, and it's something that you as members of
this Board of Trustees will also face sometime. And that was, to get the kind of budget that you want for Florida A&M University.

And I had to face the Board of Regions to get that accomplished many times by standing publicly and facing the Chancellor of the system, representing the Board of Regions, because the Board of Regions would not put forth the budget that I thought was necessary for Florida A&M University.

I just say that we thought because I didn't know unilaterally, and vice-presidents and faculty here, but you know what? We had to fight in order to get it accomplished, and that was very significant. And I'm proud to say we never lost a battle. Even when the Chancellor stood on this side, and I stood on that side to face the Resolutions Committee; the outcome, whether it was building a football stadium or the frontal for the School of Business and Industry, or whatever it was we came out. But it was because we had a strong strategic plan built for the things that we were talking about, we knew what we were talking about and we could present it better than the Board of Regions' representative.

So I said that for a reason. You've got to have your strong plan. You've got to know what that plan
is, what it means, and how to present it for those who
must make the final decision.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Thank you.

FORMER PRESIDENT GAINOUS: I've just got to say,
I'm sorry. I apologize to all of you.

First of all, Dr. Ammons did not follow
Dr. Humphries as President at Florida A&M University.
Did I say that? We're good to go.

The question, ma'am, Madam Trustee Shannon, is
perhaps more relevant at the evolution stage of the
process, becoming -- changing from a state institution
to a local institution for state purposes. As
president, I had 27 board meetings in 30 months. Some
of them were not 30 days apart. It led me to axiom,
and that axiom is the gavel in the hand of a fool is
the most powerful thing in the room, for it far
exceeds the intellectual capabilities and capacity of
the cumulative audience.

Now, what we did not have was a process; a
process that would take us from when we don't agree to
where we do agree; that would take us from the unknown
to the discovered; that would take us from the past to
the future. Every governing body has designated
responsibilities in order to operate within those
responsibilities, but the process is what it stands
on. The process is not who we are. The process is
how we find solutions to the problems we don't yet
know we have.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Thank you, Dr. Gainous.

Dr. Robinson.

DR. ROBINSON: No, I think I answered that

question, I believe.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: You did.

Members of the Board, any more questions for or

comments for Dr. Robinson and Dr. Smith? Those on the

phone, can you hear me? Okay. Hearing that, we're

going to take a -- time now is 3:18.

If we will reconvene at 3:25 and then we'll start

the next portion. Thank you.

(Brief recess taken.)

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: We're going to move to the

section. Are we ready with the audio? We are? Okay.

Board members, we're going to move forward with

our next group of presidents.

Dr. Greg Gainous and Dr. Ammons, welcome.

FORMER PRESIDENT GAINOUS: Thank you very much,

Mr. Chair. Thanks to the board members for the

opportunities to appear before you today. I feel

privileged to see my colleagues again. Let me finish

up that last bit. I think the Board of Florida A&M
University has gotten progressively better.

I think the Board is in a position where it is responsible for prudent and wise decision-making and visiting issues, as well as you have the strategic planning that will make Florida A&M a millennium university not an HBCU. We just happen to serve a large cabinet of African-American students, but I think the goal has to be enhancing Florida A&M University.

And chairman, it may take revisiting the Judge Adams' lawsuit about parenting and about quality of the allocation of resources and programs in the state, in order to have at least a platform that is unshakeable by local politics in order to get some of that.

Some of the things that were accomplished during my time, and in those 30 months we were able to fight the big fires and prepare for board meetings, and that's the trigger that you got to decide, as every organization has decided, how often.

We thought there were some things that were most important and we fought all of the issues including the engineering school. I've known TK Wetherell for some years prior to that. He and I would meet on a regular basis and at least once a month, TK, myself,
the President at TCC and the President's
Superintendent would sit and have discussions about
education efforts and collaborate. But it was the
individual meetings with TK and myself and those quiet
Saturday morning breakfasts where we really got things
understood, and those things that did not reach the
public ear.

The other thing on the Engineering School, the
Board of Governors, I understand how they work behind
the scenes, but the engineering question was not a
behind-the-scenes question. It was a very public
question and they should have had the courage to
address it very publicly.

Federal funds, we sat out to gain federal funds.
I mean, federal funds that amounted to something.
$37,500. Not 50,000 but millions. We had at that
time Neil Young from Orlando and we had the pharmacy
program in his area. We knew from other
appropriators, but we also knew that we didn't want to
not be on the list when it came to the list of federal
funds that came into the state of Florida from
Congress. So we set about doing that, and we did it.
We were either Number 1 or Number 2, in those three
years, in the amount of funds we had gotten from
Washington D.C.
I'll give you one example Tom Parkins (phonetic) gave us $500,000. At the time, we don't have a program; no, we don't. But a young man at the architecture school, his family took care of Tom Parkins' house in the island, so he gave us that $500,000.

Because we went to Washington and he said, "You have 15 minutes, President Gainous." We left out of the meeting 45 minutes later, because we had something in common, something in common, so we built a platform there with him and got the half-million dollars.

But that went up 10, 24, the amount of money that we got, because we hired a person who worked with Florida A&M University to be in Washington D.C. So when Dr. Robinson needed some help there, he went up and worked with him; when others needed help, he worked with them. And he was a very good writer and staunch FAMU.

Probably enrollment, growth and student progression were our major concerns. The economics of the university system and any funding formula, you crystallize a set of generalizations, and in most of those cases they did not apply equitably to FAMU. We were the only university in the state university system that was upside-down in terms of enrollment
patterns. We had more juniors and seniors than we did freshman and -- no, we had more freshman and sophomores than we did juniors and seniors.

We may have gotten $500,000: $5,000, funding for freshman and sophomore; we may have gotten $12,000 for juniors and seniors; 30-plus-thousand for graduate students. But the only way you can get the students to continue and to progress was to work with them, work with the individual colleges and schools to find out what it is that is not happening.

So we actually established an office of the freshman and sophomore year research that was to cut across the University, to determine what is it that's happening to almost 15 and 1600 students we would lose after their sophomore year. They just wouldn't come back. So that program was designed to better what we could do to keep those student in school and help them graduate.

The federal funds and the student progression and student enrollment, and we got the enrollment up to 13,106 students, and that takes a lot of effort because when we would go out student recruitment affairs, almost without exception, 98 percent of the room in April and May had not taken the ACT or the SAT. Simply had not. They had not decided they were
going to go to college, and those that thought they
were going was going because a friend was going, but
they had not taken the SAT, ACT. So that became a
counseling session for us as to, "Please go back and
take it. This is when it's offered." So the guidance
of counseling that they receive at the high schools
and other places was not sufficient to allow those
students to progress with their classmates across the
state.

Grants and contracts. I set aside $50,000 -- not
a lot of money -- for faculty in 5 and $10,000 grants;
$10,000 grants that they would work with, submit, and
write a proposal or grant to work with schools on the
Southside of Tallahassee, our future student body, and
challenge them to do a $100,000,000, and gave them
three years of which to do it.

Well, in less than 12 months, a faculty of less
than 700 had $106 million in single and multi-year
contracts and grants. That a heck of a lot of money.
That's also a lot of work and a lot of accomplishments
of a faculty at the University.

And you say, why, is that important?

Well, at the time, I think Dr. Robinson was --
there was a 40 or 46 percent or 45 percent indirect
cost that was to come to the University. The goal was
to enhance undergraduate education. Chronicle of
Power Education reports that FAMU students go to
prestigious law schools. They're the top five in the
nation. I knew that we had students at Harvard
Universities, Law School, Medical School, Dental
School, that's the number one student. I knew we had
students at Duke majoring in finance. I knew how many
number one students we had at these prestigious
institutions, NYU. You know?

What's happens, and I know how many of our
engineering students were going to Georgia Tech to get
PhDs in engineering; I'm wondering why can't they come
to us. But the undergraduate education has to be the
bedrock upon which you build your masters and PhD
programs, and that's what I left undone; what I did
not get a chance to do. Because I believe the
University has to have, must have, a strong first four
years, and the strength of that first four years start
with year one and two.

So those are the things that we focused on, just
the economics. And you asked a question about what
are some of the things that were difficult. I would
say the Board of Governors was a part of our
difficulty. I didn't find them of good intention nor
did I find them trustworthy.
They had a meeting at the University of Florida, in fact. The University of Florida had somebody steal almost a million dollars from their foundation, and when the guy got up to address them, somebody asked the question about it.

And I said, "I'm not going to talk about that today. I've got 10 minutes and then I'm going to have the catch a plane, and dah, dah, dah."

And the chairman says, "Okay, we won't talk about those things today."

We was there because we could not find three million dollars in appropriation. Well, you know, something has to be wrong. Nobody has seen this money. We can't account for it. Those dollars was still down in the Florida State Department of Education. Those dollars were for construction dollars. We had to spend the money, give them their bills, and they would send us the money.

When I got here, that project was already a couple of years old, and no money had been spent but they treated us as though we had stolen the money. And in fact three members of the Board of Governors that day declared discrimination.

What I'm saying to you is, just because they are the Board of Governors, your due diligence should not
change. Whatever it is that you're going to put in Dr. Robinson's report as a final, as you adopt it, got to be your marching order.

And the guy at the Board of Governors then was the former CEO of what's that airlines, the airlines that failed in Florida -- that's who it was. So because they are there does not mean all of their experiences are successful, that their guidance is good. And the policies of the Board of Governors was of great concern to us, especially the 120 hours, because we knew we have more students at that time who had graduated with more than a 120 hours than you did with students with the 120 hours.

We needed time to make the adjustments about the Board of Governors' policies, the conversations about their policies and ultimately they come to be, somebody needs to stand by the door and watch and guard that process so that you can minimize the impact of it on FAMU, just as Dr. Robinson was stating to you earlier.

It's a combination of things. Everybody can't go home at 5:00. Somebody has to do those things that can only be done at one-on-one meetings behind closed doors, with a copy of the Board's mission statement, just positioned by
the budget for the University, and those things are
not to waiver, are not to change.

But the federal funds and all of these are
related. The federal funds, then management of the
growth and production of students and grants and
contracts. The 45 percent was just money so students
could continue their education outside of the
classroom. There's a Dr. Clark in Thomasville,
Georgia, that works with NASA on proposal. Dr. Ben
Wing of the engineering school was doing some research
that all equaled into proposal, the bulky board. And
you say why is that important? Well, we went to
California, went to Boeing, showed the demonstrations
of the bulky board, and they need some things that
will change based on temperature, not the flaps that
move mechanically. And the bulky (phonetic) board
will do that this guy that won the Nobel Prize for it,
was about that size. What he saw FAMU students
producing was about this size.

So you have, I think, the nucleus of an
institution that is the capable of educating
outstanding people, but that's your responsibility, to
set that tone. You've got to be responsible for the
quality of education at this institution, and you have
got to pass it down the line to the Deans through the
administration. It just has to be. Give me a strong undergraduate program and I'll give you an even stronger graduate program.

Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Thank you, Dr. Gainous.

Dr. Ammons?

FORMER PRESIDENT AMMONS: Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, former presidents, and all who had gathered here, and President Mangum, I want to -- first of all, thank you all for this opportunity for the former presidents to come and be a part of this very serious discussion about the future of Florida A&M University.

I want to publicly apologize to President Gainous. I think I said I was the one who said came after Dr. Humphries. Technically, I did, but I didn't come right after him.

FORMER PRESIDENT GAINOUS: Yeah.

FORMER PRESIDENT AMMONS: I want to apologize to you for that.

FORMER PRESIDENT GAINOUS: No apology needed.

FORMER PRESIDENT AMMONS: Thank you. My talk for a few minutes is in the context of a strategic plan. I had the opportunity to go back and reflect on the existing strategic plan, which I had the opportunity
to work with this entire campus and this entire community. We had some really smart people who were a part of that structure that we put together to address the future of Florida A&M University as we looked towards 2020.

As I reflected on it, there are many components of that plan that are still relevant today, even though you approved it -- well, the Board approved it back in 2009. It is, however, a new era, and I think all of us understand that. Dr. Robinson talked about what's going on in Washington and what also is going on in the State of Florida around performance funding, and it is worrisome for those of us who have been associated with Florida A&M University because what I see in performance funding, instead of it being an approach to include, it appears to be excluding students from the higher education system here in the state of Florida, and in particular, students of color. It goes to the mission of Florida A&M University, and not only was I a student here, a faculty member, now administrator, Provost, President; I had the opportunity, Dr. Humphries, to serve with Dr. Charles Smith; you named him chair of the Mission Statement Committee for the University. That was many years ago, and one of the biggest fights that we had
with our mission statement was the inclusion of the words "graduate study and research" as a part of our mission, because that mission statement had to go to the Board of Regions.

But also, as important as "graduate study and research" and even more important was the fact that our mission said that we were upon "access to higher education;" we were a gateway to a better life for students of color, and for that matter, for any students who wanted to come to Florida A&M University but we were established to serve African-Americans.

And so, as I look at where we are today, performance funding, all of the measures, there is a concern about our mission and where this University will go in the future. And so, as we talk about the strategic plan, of course the vision and the mission statements set the stage for what the institution is going to do and where the institution is going to go in the future. And so I say to the Board that we must strongly consider how we move this institution forward and stay true to our mission because the mission that we have of Florida A&M is the right mission.

I see some concerns that are being raised by performance funding, which goes to the next issue -- Dr. Gainous and Dr. Humphries mentioned this -- but in
particular growth. We have to find a way within this system to grow Florida A&M University. We cannot continue to have this downward and study stake enrollment in this institution.

In order for FAMU to grow, we already have outstanding programs. I mean, we have some of the most high-demand programs in the economy right here at Florida A&M University, and there is a history of success in producing people who have gone from this institution to be leaders in their respective fields and in this global economy.

As we look moving forward, academic programs are going to drive the attractiveness and they're going to drive the growth of this institution. New programs, cutting edge programs, some were stemmed from disciplines that are already in place here. There are other disciplines that haven't even been thought of yet.

We have to put our faculty in a position where they can be creative and capitalize on all of the opportunities that are out there; right now many unseen. One of the strengths that we have is this conglomeration of academic programs. But as we look at the future, not only must there be new programs, but we're going to have to go within these
disciplines, that are in many cases silos, and capitalize on the synergies to create true and interdisciplinary programs, such as double majors.

Now, I don't mean giving a student a degree in interdisciplinary studies, because I have concerns about interdisciplinary studies without a concrete skill set. This economy requires student graduates to have skills, but I do think that there are synergies that we can encourage our faculty to sit down together and look at how courses from your discipline might fit in to our discipline, to give students a competitive edge as they go out in the marketplace.

And so, I would hope that as we look at the strategic plan, one of the things we look at are the interconnections among and between disciplines that are already here. In terms of new programs, I firmly believe that FAMU must have the new programs that we talked about in the center of excellence. There were 10 PhD programs that Dr. Humphries talked about, and in 2001, we were able to get the PhD and physics. The other PhD programs are still on the table and we need to move towards the development and implementation towards those programs.

Another component for growth are facilities. The plan that we developed as a part of our strategic plan
and you-all have seen it, is that we would address facilities on the campus. Our thoughts were that we would construct an 800-bed residential hall, and it would serve as a place that we would shift students as we close and renovate other residence halls, and at the same time maintain historical significance of those hall.

The dorm I lived in, Young's Hall, was renovated, we came out with -- they tell me less space, but we maintain the historical significance of that residential facility. There are other facilities on this campus that have historical significance, and so, as we look at say the next 10, 15, 20 years -- whatever the length of the strategic plan would be -- facilities would play a critical role, especially residential facilities.

When I came to FAMU and moved in to Young Hall, Young Hall was an improvement. The facilities that we have on our campus today are not an improvement, but many students who come to the institution, and bottom line is, we've got to compete, because as we go to these other campuses, so many things are new and they're nice and they have food in them, and they have all of these amenities. And so, a facilities component and strategic plan must be clear that we're
going to have the campus of the future, and especially
our residential and our teaching facilities.

Technology. I can't say enough about technology
and we all know that technology drives everything.

When I came to FAMU, as President, you were trying to
get the enterprise system off of the ground, People
Soft, and we had to invest a lot of money, a lot of
the people-power in getting People Soft up and running
to serve the needs of this campus.

We were able to get it up and running. We
reengineered administrative processes and procedures,
and that's a part of this recruitment and retention as
well. All of these things should be transparent to a
student as well as to the faculty. They don't need to
know that somebody was out sick this week and we
couldn't get to it. Everything should be transparent.

All they want are the results of whatever that
transaction should be.

Technology and teaching. We were able to launch
the first distance learning programs because we had
the appropriate technology in order to do that,
programs. The programs in business and nursing and
purchase health, our first three programs, and now
there are courses; courses that should be designed for
those students who some of them who have already been
here at FAMU, who can't come back physically but should have access to our academic programs. So technology would drive that.

And then we talk about recruitment. We have to decide, how big is FAMU going to be? We always thought, Dr. Humphries, that we should have been a 15,000 students, but the programs that we have, the location, the academic reputation of Florida A&M, well, there are ways that we can get there through both recruitment an also retention. There is something new to higher education today predictive data analytics.

All of corporate America and many universities are now using big data to make decisions. Big data will allow you to get out in front of issues instead of talking about what happened, and now we can see what happened. We have to position ourselves to be an even bigger user example -- I know we're doing that now, but an even bigger user of productive data analytics.

It's just the same way that the business world, and especially stores, follow our certain behavior on the internet. You know, sometimes we wonder how in the world does Neiman Marcus pop up when I'm out there surfing. Well, they have done all of this analysis of
our patterns, of our shopping patterns, and they know
what we're interested in. We ought to do the same
thing with students of today. Certain social media is
huge, so we have to combine a high tech and a high
touch approach to recruitment.

The same with retention. Faculty members must
have the ability to know what is going on with the
student, but at least predict using profiles of
students who have left and students who have succeeded
both in the past and make some predictions about how
we're going to deplore resources in order to retain
students in this institution until they complete their
degrees.

And then, the last thing, I've got two other
things I'm just going to mention because I know we're
out of time. Our accreditation. Accreditations is
key, as you know. And the then the last thing,
Dr. Grable, we've got to strengthen the salary of our
faculty.

This faculty, the last raise they got was a three
percent raise, back in 2010, I think, after we went
through restructuring. And all of these things that
we hear about FAMU not having an appropriate
graduation rate or appropriate retention rates; on the
other hand, we should be celebrating as faculty,
because they have taken the students that we brought to them and we still graduate more African-American students than most traditional colleges and universities across this country.

And so, that is the other thing that we need to make certain we do as a part of this strategic plan. We have to strengthen the salaries of the faculty.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Thank you, Dr. Ammons. I made some notes, Dr. Ammons, from your presentation. I add more attractive programs for quality enrollment, growth by maximizing existing program, upgrades to the facilities as part of the process, technology as well, using predictive data analytics for recruitment and retention, and then strengthening faculty salaries.

And taking away from that, these are the things I heard from you before and I thought they would also be helpful for the Board to hear.

Dr. Gainous, can you join Dr. Ammons? At this time we'll move into the Q and A section. Members of the Board, questions? Concerns? Comments for Dr. Gainous and Dr. Ammons?

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Dr. Grable -- Trustee Grable and Trustee Moore.

TRUSTEE GRABLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

For both Dr. Gainous and Dr. Ammons, Dr. Ammons,
you specifically mentioned, put faculty in a position
to be more creative. Could you elaborate on that a
little more, sir?

FORMER PRESIDENT AMMONS: Yeah. I think that one
of the laments that I have, as Provost and also as
President, is that we didn't have more collaboration
across disciplines, and we have some powerful
disciplines that if we put them together, our students
would leave here going into interviews and just
blowing people away.

And so, I think there are some incentives that we
can put in place, sort of similar to what Dr. Gainous
talked about, where he put a pot of money together for
faculty members to work with neighborhood schools. I
think we could possibly find, and what I did with the
funds that I had was I put it in research into faculty
research programs, and so today when faculty members
get their plaques, they also get a check.

But I think if we put together an
interdisciplinary innovation pool, that it could break
down some of those academic silos that exist. As I
look across the country in some of the top
institutions, Dr. Humphries mentioned MIT. MIT has an
outstanding technology and policy program but the
students get all of the technical requirements of an
engineer and when they leave, they are technically sound, but they also have a policy background that will allow them to go and work in Washington, for instance, as policy analysts or staff to congress or whatever.

So, that's what I think could be possible if we were able to have a discourse across disciplines, where faculty can look at their programs and see how, together, we can create a powerful graduate, even more powerful than we have now.

FORMER PRESIDENT GAINOUS: One of the tough things is hiring of faculty. We have talked about having a department determine what skills and competencies a new faculty member should have, and if they identified 10 and they saw some potential with the new faculty person, and that faculty person only had 8 of the 10, that department may hire that individual but would have to determine and make plans for that individual to gain the other two competencies that they did not have.

And that way, you've got senior faculty work with junior faculty, you've got faculty members working throughout the department to make sure that every faculty member had the minimum competencies and skills needed to be a good faculty person.
CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Thank you. Trustee Moore.

TRUSTEE MOORE: You had mentioned the 13,000-plus enrollment, and I guess in retrospect, when you look at larger enrollments, where we are now and where you were then, capacity issues, systems to support that. So yes, the number was there. What would you do, as something in retrospect, something that you wish you had better in place to support that. Because students are coming in with different needs, so as we look forward with the potential of growing numbers.

FORMER PRESIDENT GAINOUS: First of all, Dr. Ammons did an excellent job about talking about the facilities, that's number one. Because my daughter went to school in the same classroom that my sister had gone in, and the same one that, you know, cousins from decades before in the same classroom. I wish we had more smart classrooms, more adaptable classrooms.

And I wish we could have -- but I wish we had academic advisement to be true academic advisement; not an option, not a choice, but academic advisement where you had to make at least X number of appearances in the office of your academic advisor. I wish we had the resources to hire more counselors to advise students, to nurture students. We had a significant
number of students who were enrolled in Florida A&M who on their FAFSA indicated their income was between one dollar and $15,000. That student needs real, realtime support, and we should be able to provide them with some of that support that would allow them to be able to be successful.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Trustee Washington?

TRUSTEE WASHINGTON: Dr. Ammons, thank you for being here. You mentioned that performance funding is more exclusionary than inclusionary. I would encourage you to elaborate on that and talk about maybe recommendations for maybe positioning itself to maximize impact given its unique student population.

FORMER PRESIDENT AMMONS: Yeah. As you look across the State University System, you look at all of the institutions, and the number of African-American students is declining, and it's declining because these measures that have been put in place are right above the average African-American student coming out of high school. And so, we're getting students -- at least students are graduating without meeting the minimum admissions criteria for the State University System of Florida.

And then, there was a stigma placed upon the students and the institutions to take students who
don't have everything, who don't have all of the
units, all of the math, English, second language, et
cetera, and so those students are being encouraged to
go to the community colleges and because of that,
students who would have come to Florida A&M are not
being admitted, because there is a penalty if you
don't -- if you don't admit students who meet all of
the requirements and then at the end they don't
graduate on time. Before performance funding, funding
was based on enrollment, so during my administration
it was enrollment funding. And so, Mr. President, we
went to 13,300.

FORMER PRESIDENT GAINOUS: I will check your
numbers.

FORMER PRESIDENT AMMONS: All right. So it
appears, I mean, if you just looked at it, it appears
we now have a system in place where that keeps
students outside of the State University System in
Florida. So what we have to do, and we have to do
this collectively and we've talked about it, because I
think anybody who looks at the number, we have to get
together -- all of us -- the FAMU community, and we
have to talk about the difference that this
institution makes in the lives of students. Because I
really think that -- and Dr. Humphries we talked about
this -- I think a student who come to FAMU and to many
other HBCUs, and it's not just in Florida it's
nationally -- students have to stop out.

Dr. Gainous just talked about income, family
income. Family income is probably the strongest
variable in student graduation, all right? And so,
students have to stop out and work; and then, two,
there is a value in posture of education at FAMU. We
would suggest that if you looked at students who
didn't finish at FAMU, they went to somewhere else and
finished. They didn't just stop, but those students
are not a part of this formula. All right?

And so, what we have to get together, we have to
look at and dissect this system. We've got some great
minds in this room around this table, and we have to
dissect this issue and we have to make an argument.
And first of all, we're not saying you shouldn't have
standards, but we're saying that people who have the
will, who have the determination and who have the
commitment, that they ought to be allowed a chance.

And then, we've got to look at what we do in
terms of need, based aid, because many of the
students, again, are leaving without -- or they're
leaving because they're running out of money, and at
the same time we award money to an incoming class.
All right? So we've got to look at, you know, how we
do these things, but again, I think if we look at the
analytics, it would tell us precisely what is going
on with those students and we can put together a plan.

I think there's some things we have to do. We
have to do a better job. There's some students we can
save, and we've got to do a better job, but we also
have to make that external argument that there is a
value in coming to Florida A&M University, even if you
don't have all of the things that they say you should
have.

FORMER PRESIDENT GAINOUS: During my last year,
we looked at some data, and it showed that Florida A&M
University students work either full- or part-time
more than any other students in the university system.
It also showed Florida A&M University students
graduated owing more than three times the amount as a
student would from the University of Florida and
Florida State, in terms of loans.

If you then turn to the socioeconomic side of it
in the community and see who is the first to be hired,
who is the second to be hired, who is the last to be
hired, and then look at who is the first to be fired,
it then will give you your default rate on a student
loans in that order. So the socioeconomic part of it,
providing the services.

Florida State, for example, they are 52 councils in one year, so when -- in an effort to be an preeminent institution when it says, "What's the graduation rate of your African-American students;" sure, it's high. Sure it is, because of your GPA change of .25 percent, somebody is going to send you a text message, somebody is going to e-mail you, somebody is going to set you an appointment for you to have some counseling so we can work through these issues.

Well, if that's good academic practices, then we ought to be able to do that as well, but we've got to consider meeting these students' needs once they get to campus. We also took a look at the number of African-American students in our feeder states, who made 1250, and who did this and did that. There were not enough students there to hardly make a class of SBI, who had scored more than 1250 on the SAT, and what surprised me the most is Georgia had a higher number than Florida, so there is -- obviously, it's not just a local problem. It's not just a community problem. We've got an inherent problem across the country on the performance of African-American students on exams that measure. And now that the Ivy
League schools are going away from those tests to a large degree, perhaps there is a benefit there at least perception-wise for us. But once you get home, we got to put something on the plate for these student to advance in.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Board members, I throw out for your consideration -- and again, it's feedback and we have received it from you in your capacity as chief executives -- the Board at some point is going to need to take a position with regard to where we're headed, and there's one position that's not totally nuanced in around -- I guess I can say it as directly as possible. Let's go to the folks that are setting the standards and setting the expectation and tell them they need to change.

I don't see that as a viable path. I see that the entire system is being held to it, and this is just one position. The Board will get here in terms of its discussion, but when the standards of performance based are put on the system, I just don't see where there's an appetite to carve out an exception with regard to where we are, regardless of whether our argument or prevailing argument is correct or whether it's right.

So it puts us in a stronger position, at least in
my position and my opinion, when we're able to perform
to the extent that we can. So, either we look at
potentially telling those who are putting those on us
that they need to change, or we look at our position
as a unit within the State University System and how
we can meet the challenge.

All of you have served in the role of Chief
Executive, and at this point I don't see us having the
luxury of us being able to rewrite the rules. Now,
whether we -- if you could agree, whether we agree
with performance funding or not, this is where we are.
I would see where it would be productive for us to
look at ways to meet that standard, knowing that
whatever if we're right or wrong, but knowing there
are reasons why we don't.

But let's look at positive forward thinking
solutions for us to meet the expectation -- and I'm
not saying it in a negative way, versus what the
problems and challenges were in the past. So it's
very helpful as we continue to hear from you, but
we're asking for input in the strategic planning
process.

As we look forward, we're asking for you to help
us at least from sharing from a strategic visioning
perspective how we can meet what's in front of us now.
We don't have the luxury of going back.

I'm going to ask in the interest of time, I'm going to ask if there are additional comments, members of the Board, and then we'll close out.

Any additional comments? I have two. I have Trustee Warren and Trustee McWilliams.

Trustee Warren.

TRUSTEE WARREN: This issue of developmental education is a pervasive one, throughout the state K12, and it lands at our front door, at the colleges, community colleges and at the university.

I can't recall in the performance funding model if the adverse impact is on failure to graduate or if it's on the front end of admissions of profile admits, but a broader view, however, of how we deal with profile admits. Both of you have alluded to dealing with the issue of the financial inhibitors, and for those who do make it through they end up with quite a bit of debt and the intellectual on how they score on the SAT.

I would appreciate your ideas and input to this, Board, if we're going to deal with the issue of developing education and those two components to it, intellectual development and the financial issues that relate to those kinds of students; what we can do as a
University that addresses these things, and help us.
If we take in a higher number of profile admits, then
we also accept the ownership of getting them to the
end. There's no sense in taking in a large number and
not have the infrastructure in place to see them to
graduation in four.

There ought to be an objective in how we do that.
I'm lost with a design, but as professionals in the
room, how do you do that and do that with the
constraints that we have in the performance funding
model?

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: We have about 10 minutes in
this segment left and I'm also going to give the
gentleman a chance to speak, but please, if you will
address the question.

FORMER PRESIDENT AMMONS: I think one of the
starting places is that we've got to look at history;
in other words, we have to look at those students who
have left. We need to know what happened to them; why
did they leave, and so, you're not going to be able to
develop a system or a plan to address it if you don't
know what the reasons where. And that's why I talked
about the importance of this -- the big data.

We have databases, but I think there are some
things we can add to that database that will give us
the ability to garner from either the students themselves or data that we already had in the system on those students as to why they didn't persist and graduate. And I think if we do that, say, for -- if you we go back for a few years, we'll have a pretty good profile of the students who not only come to the institution but also leave without a degree and those who are successful.

I don't think you're going to be able to develop any kind of system without having the data, the historical data, to put in place the precise treatments, if you will, that you need.

FORMER PRESIDENT GAINOUS: And I think some of those things will have to be not funded by a State University System. We've always had a fairly unhealthy FTE funding anyways, and we can use private sources to fund some of those programs. Because some of those students do have the ability to learn.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Dr. Robinson?

FORMER PRESIDENT ROBINSON: I might -- this is something that's dear to all of us, and I just want to interject one thing to this issue, performance funding -- maybe two things.

Trustee Warren, first of all, there are -- and I understand the realities of performance fundings are
there are models out there, that do give the
institutions involved in it a bit more credit for what
they do, to bring students from here to here; that is,
the impact. Students who -- universities who tend to
address the economic status of the students from the
start and manage to get them through, there are some,
you know, some rewards and appreciation that comes
with that.

It's a little bit more challenging and difficult
to do that. Tennessee model, for example. The other
thing, too, though is there is -- and I think this is
what Dr. Gainous and Dr. Ammons were alluding to --
that is, you can get all of the resources in the world
we don't have enough ever, but it's going to be hard
to make up for the audit deficiencies, when they are
academic deficiencies, out of a K through 12 system in
a program that we can do here in its entirety.

There are going to be some things we can do for
sure, and we have been very successful through that.
So what we've been talking about within the Strategic
Planning Task Force is what we can do to help the pool
that are coming out of public, that can walk into our
classrooms in less need of the type of programs to get
them through, right?

We have a college education system. We have a
developmental research school. Tommy Mitchell brings
this up at every meeting. We ought to know more about
what it takes, no matter what economic status is,
about paying for a bona fide education experience than
anybody in the state of Florida. Those are our
constituents, right?

We're going to have strategically do more in
terms of telling every parent, at the very least, that
if you default to the minimum graduation requirements
for the public school system in Florida, you're not
going to be ready for FAMU, you're not going to be
ready for Tallahassee Community College, you aren't
going to be ready for Santa Fe Community College. You
just aren't going to be ready.

We understand all of the implications around
this. We talked about this in our committee a bit,
Trustee Shannon; there are models of people engaging
more in those communities where parents might not be
there, economic resources might not be there, and
helping to do this to become better, prepared because
as you read in the literature -- and we provide this
in some of the Task Force meeting -- interestingly
enough, in some states, California, some schools in
their system are taking kids that come from very
modest economic background and they're getting them
out faster, right? So we're going to have to implore some of those tactics as well.

Our recruitment and our engagement has to extend beyond recruiting the best and the brightest from the senior year of high school.

FORMER PRESIDENT HUMPHRIES: I've been chomping at the bit to talk.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: One final comment.

Trustee McWilliams.

TRUSTEE McWILLIAMS: I think this is the biggest dilemma, in my opinion, that we face. I think that the things that you-all are saying, I made those same arguments in the '70s and when I was out front making those arguments with the presidents and so forth, and they were true. We were special. We were the only people that were paying attention to the kind of student that you're talking about. But the other schools have begun to do the same thing. They have begun to develop programs. FSU has programs in Gadsden County and around the county. They have also refined these programs to get those people through and they don't impact negatively upon their retention and graduation rates.

We were special, and I've made this statement before, we have decide at this point in history if we
still want to be special or we want to be equal. And
I think we can be equal. I think we can do all these
other things these people are doing and we can do it
better, and that's what I would like to see.

Do we want the brand that helps the guy that
can't get in any place else? If you do, you're going
to lose a lot of upper end people that Humphries used
to bring in. When we brand ourselves as the school
for people that were exceptional people, like people
who were recruited by Dr. Lewis, Dr. Mobley; all of
these great --

FORMER PRESIDENT HUMPHRIES: Y'all are going to
make me mad. This is being discussed as if we didn't
do anything and there was a lot that was done.

I need to talk because y'all are not getting it.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: We're moving.

TRUSTEE McWILLIAMS: I'm going. What I'm saying
is I just don't think we have that option. I agree
with the chairman. I don't think we have to the
option. If they're saying we have the metrics and
everybody else is doing; if you want to be a member of
SUS this is the expectations are, I think we have to
gear our efforts in that direction. That's all I'm
saying.

FORMER PRESIDENT GAINOUS: No question about
that. We will agree. What we're says is before this
is established, get involved.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: But they've already been
established.

FORMER PRESIDENT GAINOUS: There will be others
that come after these.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Thank you, gentlemen.

First, Dr. Lewis and then Dr. Humphries.

Dr. Lewis.

FORMER PRESIDENT LEWIS: Mr. Chair, members of
the Board of Trustees, thank you as well for the
opportunity, because I think it's very, very
productive and one that we haven't done before and you
need, as a Board, to hear what has happened before,
what has worked before, and what can indeed work going
forward in that regard.

I think being like everybody else and being
different are not mutually exclusive. We've got to do
what the big girls do in our system, but always we're
going to look like who we look like. So I challenge
is: How do we be like the big girls and still serve
the individuals that we have served for over 125
years, and I think that's what the challenge of this
board has to come up with and find solutions to.

When I served as Dean of the School of Pharmacy,
I knew that we had to be bigger and even better than
the School of Pharmacy at the University of Florida.
Dr. Ammons and I got together in an effort to grow the
School of Pharmacy to the size that it is.

We talked about Accreditation Council and I
talked about the School of Pharmacy and I knew that
the guidelines were changing from a BS of pharmacy to
a doctor of pharmacy, and we had to change. We were
the first school in the state of Florida to make that
change, but the then-Board of Regions, tabled our
proposal that was there a year and nine months before
the University of Florida and took both of them up at
the same day, same time, and we were both granted the
doctor of pharmacy degree at the same time. I
resubmitted our proposal over 20 months ahead of time.

That system is not going to change. It's is till
the same system you deal with right now. Now, our
challenge is, how do we maximize our productivity in
that system and still serve the people that we got to
serve in that regard.

And Dr. Gainous talked a little bit about it.
Dr. Robinson did, too, about being at the table. Our
Deans have got to be at the table where all of these
guidelines -- they got to serve on these boards across
this nation, in order for us to be at the cutting edge
all of the kinds of activities I brought on and higher
education today. If they're not there, then they're
not bringing back the most contemporary artists in the
respective disciplines that must be there in that
regard.

When we started the PhD program in the School of
Pharmacy -- and I say School of Pharmacy because it
wasn't a School of Pharmacy at that time -- there were
forces that did not want, as you heard earlier, for us
to start that program. In fact, on the day before the
Board of Regions approved that program, the post
Secondary Education Planning Commission, who has to
make a recommendation to that board, met. They were
going to vote and they did vote to not grant Florida
A&M University authorization for a PhD in
pharmaceutical sciences.

What they didn't know, Dr. Smith was the janitor
of the Post-Secondary Education Planning Commission
found information in the garbage can, who transferred
to another janitor at Florida A&M University, who
happened to be my daddy and we walked into the Board
of Regions meeting the next morning where the
executive director of the board, of Post-Secondary
Education Board was there and we had the real set of
minutes with us.
Turn the tide. We got the PhD program in pharmaceutical sciences established and we have since been largest producer of African-Americans degrees in pharmaceutical sciences in this nation. All because of two janitor.

More importantly, he had the vision. Dr. Charles Walker at that time had the vision to make Florida A&M University a PhD granting institution, and Dr. Ammons talked about the funding performance, and Trustee Washington, you were right on target.

The funding formula has been designed to keep FAMU at the lower level of funding because they knew that freshman and sophomore was where our concentration was, and the money deliberately was set at the lower sophomore freshman level than the junior, senior, Graduate 1 and Graduate 2 at the PhD level. Dr. Humphries knew that, and he's about going to tell you about it I'm sure in a minute, but he knew how to play the numbers. He knew how the play the numbers, and to make sure we got these students in the upper division and graduate so that we can get the funding. So you've got to know the numbers.

And our vice-presidents, particularly VP for the administration, got to know these numbers and got to get them to the President whenever they come out. And
we got to figure out, how do we keep our students
moving up from lower division to upper division.
That's going to take resources. And somebody said
earlier that the other schools have figured out this
is the way we do it. You have to have support
mechanisms at every level of it.

In pharmacy, we had advisors. After every exam,
I got a report for every student in my college -- and
there were over a thousand at that time -- who did not
pass the exam. And there was an advisor intervening
with him or her to find out why. Now, a lot of times
we haven't got their financial aid to them.

Now, you asked me what we accomplished when we
were presidents; I think my greatest accomplishment
was getting 7,000 students over $27 million on the day
after dropping air. Because I got 57 letters and
cards from apartment complex managers, from the
director of a utility department, for the City of
Tallahassee, complimenting us on getting our students
the money because they were going to the apartment
complexes, going to the City of Tallahassee saying, "I
ain't got no money."

So if you don't give them money, they can't eat.
If they can't eat, they can't study. If their lights
cut off, they can't study. I mean, we're talking
about a lot of stuff. It's nuts and bolts for me.

I'm a very simple person. What's causing my student
not to progress? And once we find out those things, a
lot of the times we don't have to spend a lot of money
to fix it.

Customer service. That was my next claim to
fame. If our students are not happy, nobody is happy.

I realize as a Dean, and the only reason I was at
Florida A&M is was because of those students. If they
didn't come, I was gone. And all of our faculty, all
of our -- particularly our staff and all of our
administrators have got to understand that it comes
from this Board, from the President, all the away
down; that is your expectation that every student at
Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University is
treated like they should be treated and like they're
treated at other institutions.

We can't beat them over the head and expect them
to talk good us. We can't deny their financial aid
without them talking bad about us. They need to go
back home and say the same thing to other students in
the community to their teachers that go to school, to
their principles. All of a sudden, we have a
recruiting problem. In order to grow the institution
back to the 13,133 or 13,5, whatever it is.
It's customer service gentlemen and ladies. It's as simple as that: We don't provide that, it's not going to happen. It really ain't going to happen.

The funding formula. Dr. Humphries talked about with those four programs, and the medical program as a part of that four programs that all of these great institutions have. I knew as the Dean of Pharmacy that FAMU needed to have all of the health science programs. He was able to through the Legislature get through; I wanted to, but he knows that. I fought my heart to get to medical school because I wanted to create the Allied health Sciences centers.

Because a part of that funding formula is get the most money even greater than Graduate 2. Now Florida State now wants an Allied Health Sciences center ladies and gentlemen, and the only program missing from them right now is Pharmacy. It ain't going to leave here, I'm telling you that. Because they want to be like the University of Florida. They want to have the Florida State, and I ain't knocking them for that. If I was there, I would do the same thing, but your job is to not let that happen. Not to let that happen.

If it ever comes up in any discussion anywhere, we have to stomp it right then. Dr. Smith talked
about fighting earlier. We all have to fight on that
one, because if pharmacy goes, this University is
gone. Now I'm not saying that only because I was a
former Dean of Pharmacy, but it's the critical crutch
that is going to help Florida State become what it
wants to be. And they're going to be that same level
of the institution and that academic health science is
the only remaining pair for them to get there. So you
need to know that and understand and appreciate that
so that does not happen.

Finally, one last thing comes up. As I listen to
all of you today, one of biggest challenges you face
in communications is communications. Up and down. I
sit on two corporate boards, and the mechanism we have
been utilizing is this little thing right here. For
communication, this little iPad here, there's a
program called Board Books. And I see all of you have
this paper -- we stop cutting trees a long time ago
when came on one of those boards -- because the board
receives every piece of information on this little
thing. I sit on a committee which meets 12 times a
year; we're going to meet 350 pages per meeting. The
book was way too thick for the president to send all
of that to you on. Every committee -- they will work
with this board -- must be done in committee.
Dr. Gainous, I believe talked about you have got to put in place the processes for operation. You got to. Instead of starting up the committee, coming up to the full board. And you've got the function in these committees. And as the staff of the University, to staff your committees that's how we function on both of the corporate boards. You're a corporate entity. Even by statute you're a corporate entity, and that's how it's got to work.

You have got to sit down and take some deliberate time to put in place those processes to help you function for effectively and efficiently in that regard, because unless you do you're still going to be facing the same kind of challenges that happen right now. There has to be dichotomy between the board and the administration or in that regard it is not going to work.

Finally, each one of you has to bring something to the table. You have your address book and your check book. The institution needs both of them. You know people that the President needs to know, you know people that can bring money to this institution, you know people who can bring students to this institution. You've got to use that platform that you sit at, from wherever you come from, to facilitate
Florida A&M.

Before you came on this board, you took an oath to support this discussion and go ahead and do it. You got to open up your checkbook, and if you can't find someone else to open theirs, because that's what your responsibility is as a Board of Trustees. I said this in 2002 and I'm saying it in 2015. That's what your responsibility is, to guide this institution. To challenge this institution, to pull it forward, and you have to put in place the people to do that and hold them accountable from to President to the vice-president to the Deans to the department all the way down, and if you do that, if you do that, you role, your responsibility as a Trustee would have been filled.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Thank you, Dr. Lewis.

Dr. Humphries.

FORMER PRESIDENT HUMPHRIES: Well, thank you very much. I look very much forward to having this opportunity, and I have to tell you that so much went through my mind as I listened to my colleagues that I wanted to tell you about in relationship to what they were saying, and I won't do a good job on that.

I want to start with I tried to make a notes of
the important stuff, because I could probably talk
about an hour-and-a-half, two hours, but I'll start
back with the kids who do not meet admission criteria
that my colleagues talked about, and I would also like
to make note -- or for y'all to make note -- I had
some significantly brilliant people working with me,
right, in Robinson and in Ammons.

Three out of the five worked with me. Ammons was
Provost, Lewis that was Dean, and Robinson just served
wherever we needed, whatever we put him in. Then you
got the distinguished lawyer back there.

So we had a good team, intelligent. They were
not "yes" men. They would fight you back if you
didn't have good ideas, and they did good work and we
were a strong institution. I had to pass out the
book. This book is about my 16-and-a-half years as
President of Florida A&M. It's called 16 Years of
Excellence, Florida A&M, and they were. They were
excellent years for our university.

And all of the stuff that I did that we did
faculty, administrators, Deans is in here, and I tried
to -- this book was put in the Foundation. I paid for
it -- really, my name should be on it because I paid
for it. Not I paid Nielson to do this.

And then in the lexicon of people who write books
for other people, if they pay you, that's their book.

You understand? And so I paid him and when it got
good to him, he stuck his name on it.

I'll go back to, you do need to get straight why
this is worth fighting for. When the people on campus
and you decide to write the mission, you got to know
why it's important that FAMU continues to fight for
its mission. Everybody says that we've got to keep
your mission the same, but what is the rationale for
that position? Well, I know the rationale for that
position, all right? And I'm not going to tell you
today. For $5,000, I'll come back and tell you.

There's a rationale for why we have to continue our
mission.

When I became President of Florida A&M we had in
the freshman class 700 students who were profiled in
METS in my first freshman class. 700, all right?

When I started the recruitment, when we started going
out and getting these top flight students to come, the
alumni would come to me and say, "What are you doing?

Trying to forget our regular mission? Are you

ignoring the kids would are first time have
difficulty, if FAMU stop going to educating those kind
of kids?"

And so, what I made a commitment to was I was
never going to have a freshman class that had had less
than 700 profile admits. Every one of my freshman
classes had 700 profile admits. Okay? Changed the
SAT from 740 to 1050 as I grew FAMU from 5,000
students to 12,250, all right? And over that time,
the increase and SAT scores moved about 300 points.
Last class had SAT better than the University of
Louisville.

We had better SAT scores than white schools. We
had top flight students, and if I had took the top 400
there wasn't a black school that even came close to us
in the SAT scores that they had, because the 400 went
all the way up to 1570 of students who had scored
those kind of scores and they were in the freshman
class at the university.

Now, what do we do? Because that's true. You
can't go out and put 700 profile admits in the
university and then say, "Gee, whiz, we are staying
true to the mission." You got to educate them and you
got to do something worthwhile with them, and so here
are the kind of things that we did.

First of all, we tested the kids. We tested them
when they got to the campus and the kids got tested.
We had faculty who said, "We're going to concentrate
in solving the problem of mathematics and English,
writing, for the students that get identified that
come out of the testing process which are all profile
admits, on improving their skills in doing that."

And so, we had faculty and the math department
who structured special courses to carry the kids from
where they were to a competent level of mastering in
mathematics.

Same thing in language. We had --

(Telephone interruption.)

FORMER PRESIDENT HUMPHRIES: One thing I can't do
is I can't work a cell phone.

We paid for establishment of all kind of
laboratories. We had a laboratory in mathematics. We
had a laboratory in reading. We had a laboratory in
writing. And we had a unit that was devoted to
tutorial services in the STEM field, and we put people
who were studying for their terminal degrees in the
STEM field to offer the tutorial services that the
kids needed in the STEM fields back then; had that
paid for by the NASA. Out of Title 3 money we put
those laboratories and stuff in for kids to come and
be able to work with the pragmatics material that was
there to enhance their skills in math and reading.

Then, the next thing that we did, which was I
think kind of novel, when we went to corporate
America, we introduced the notion that we wanted them to take three kinds of students from FAMU. The first student which we wanted them to pay for was the super student, the super black student; the student who had scored 1400 and we wanted item to underwrite the cost of educating that student, and that was the "Life Gets Better" student, and we gave them several ways to pay the money off on that.

And then the second student we talked to them about in, working with them, was a cooperative education student. We wanted to have them take a kid that's going to work a semester or six months with them and then come back and go to school six months. The third student, though, and I tell them, the third student is a question mark. I don't know if they going to make it, but I am suggesting that you and I, FAMU and your cooperation together, will educate this kid, and we'll make him better than what he is. So by the time he gets to be a senior, if you think he's the caliber of kid that you would like to hire, then you hire him. But I don't expect you to hire him because this is a kid that needs a lot of help and a lot of support, and I'm asking you to agree that you and I together, FAMU and I, that we will get that kid standing straight and graduated in a worthy
citizen by the time we are through.

Now, what was the logic behind that? In the 13 college curriculum, which I recruited Ammons in, he was in the first 13 college curriculum, and I was the director of it. We went out and got poor kids from high school and brought them to FAMU, gave them 15 bucks a week to spend, paid all of their stuff, took a hundred of them.

At Florida A&M, that 100 poor kids, many of them profile admits, 98 percent graduated in four years. 98 percent graduated in four years, okay? And they went to -- we sent a kid to Harvard's dental school, we sent a kid to Harvard's law school, we sent students to PhD programs that came out of that.

We worked a miracle with that 100 students, and we got a president of two schools out of it, right? Right here: Dr. Ammons, and he's good. And when he stood up and articulated to you today, you would not think he was a kid that came through a sort of a need-to-help program, but he was in that.

Your dentist, your dentist, Ed Scott, went to Harvard. He was in this program. So I know. Now, you know how I did that? And I'm sorry about CCNA, because we tried everything to work out a team of people, and we worked on it. What I believe is that
you shouldn't ask anybody to do something that you aren't willing to do yourself.

And so, in black colleges, we preach going to the library; that it's important that you access source material and go and check references and all of that, right? But when go, you don't see nobody. So what we did, we sign -- we assigned periods of time for everybody that worked in our program to be at the library, one week at a time, including me. I went to the library and spent one week with the kids and just being in the library so they could see me utilizing the library.

When I came back to the faculty at Florida A&M, once I completed my doctorate, I had -- when I was the senior, I checked out the Canadian Journal of Chemistry in our library, in 1957. And I went back to the library when I came back as a faculty member in 1964, and I went to the library and pulled out the Canadian Journal of Chemistry, and that was still only one name in that book. That was my name.

And I'm saying, I preach to the faculty and administrators: You've got to do what you say is important to do. Went I first was President, I used to go over library and I would stop and sit and listen to the chatter as I'm pretending to read the newspaper
and listening to the chatter from the kids. And one night I was there and there was this young lady and the guy was coming on strong and she was trying to get her Algebra straight. And she kept asking him, "Are you going to help me with this?" And I'm sitting over there listening to him, and he's trying to whisper sweet nothings in her ear.

So I said, "Young lady, let me come over there and see what your problem is." And so I went over there and I helped her understand how you solve two unknowns in Algebraic equation. And she said, "This is the President helping me," right? Well, that signals something in me about the importance of academic learning that was going on at the university.

Now, drop out, and I had the computer center print an exceptional report. The kids who were in school in the first semester who are not there in the second semester, I asked them to print that out and give it to me; give me the names, address, telephone numbers of those people. And I said in my office at 8:00 at night, since I had to telephone numbers I went down that list and I called those kids who were there the first semester, but were not there the second semester.

The first house I got was a father whose son who
had 1000 on the SAT, who had left and was back in
Orlando and he told me, he says, "Well, my son was not
fairing well and he wanted to go to beauty school, so
he's in Washington D.C." Well, I told him that can't
stand; that kid can't go to no beauty school with a
that 1000 SAT, and he's back in school. So I told
him, "Look, bring him up here, and if we get him to
consider coming back to school, I'll help pay his
tuition," to get him back in school and back in track
doing engineering, okay? There was another kid and I
just want to tell you one or two.

There was a lady in Tallahassee I called, and she
was a white woman. And I said, "I noted that your son
who was in school first semester is not in school the
second semester."

Well, she said, "Dr. Humphries, we love FAMU.
It's really a great school, but there wasn't enough of
the right kind of girls there." It meant there wasn't
enough white girls to satisfy her white son, so he
transferred to FSU so he could socialize better with
the clientele.

Well, I went down there, and what did I do with
that? On a quality basis, I called a meeting. It
involved all of the Deans, all of the department heads
and key factored -- I brought them to a dinner. I had
the computer center run by school the exception
report, and I gave that to each Dean, and I asked them
to have assigned someone in their school to find out
what happened to the kids who didn't return, every one
of them, and they had to give a report on that.

I asked the Dean of engineering and business and
one other Dean, arts and sciences, that when the next
time we met in our quarterly dinner, that I was going
to have those three Deans report on what they found
when they did that and what they were doing to correct
it. And the rest of them were supposed to get a
report on the people that were missing from them.

Now, we did that when I was president. I don't
know what happened to that. I don't know today if
that continues, but it is a sure way of cutting down
on losing students from the university.

A kid from up there in Gainesville, he dropped
out. He had a 1300 SAT. He a 3.9 academic average
and he dropped out, and he was in computer sciences
and I called the computer science department and said
where is he? And they didn't know. So I asked them
to find the guy, wherever he is, and let's get him
back in school because he's too valuable to lose.

So they found him washing dishes down in Tampa,
and they -- I told them to go get him, bring him back
to school, and why did he drop out? There was problems in his family and they pulled on him until he left school.

So the problems with dropping out and dropping in: Money first; there are family problems that pull responsibility kids out of school all right; and then there's academic failure. Those are the three things that cause kids to drop out, and if you don't intercede with them, you lose them forever, okay?

Now, I want to make one more point, Mr. Chairman. I want to say something about the Board and President. You will note that in the off chart and in referring to people who work in the University, the President is an institutional administrator. The Vice-President is Academic Affairs is an institutional administrator. The Vice-President of Student Affairs is an institutional administrator.

All vice-presidents and the President are institutional administrators. Henry was a Dean, and he is a school administrator. The institution designation means that they have University-wide responsibility. They are not responsible for the School of Business or Journalism. They are responsible for the whole of Florida A&M University.

The vice-president, institutional for student
affairs, has the whole of the student body. Academic
affairs is not over the department chemistry; it is
over all of the academic affairs. Institutional,
okay? When you evaluate one of these individuals, you
are evaluating their responsible designation, that
area of influence.

So if you say to the Vice-President of Academic
Affairs, "You're no good," all right; that person,
what you also are saying is that the quality of what
you have academically is not good because that's the
evaluation. I mean, you cannot lack somebody, all
right, but they're carrying out their institutional
responsibility in a very good way and if that is the
case, then they are doing a good job. If the
institution in their area is suffering, then no matter
how beautiful and how responsible and how much on time
and what kind of reports they write, is just great, is
of no consequence.

The question is: Is Student Affairs functioning
well at the University, and if it isn't, then that
person is not doing their job. It's an evaluation of
the area of responsibility. It's a total area of
responsibility. It's not an evaluation of an
individual in the sense of got a good personal
responsibilities and all of that, right? They have
to -- it's a big job and you pay them well, and if
it's a big job and you pay them well and the school is
suffering, they are failing, all right? Because it's
institutional in its coming.

Now I'll stop and let Henry answer questions.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Thank you, Dr. Humphries.

Board members, I made the decision to allow
Dr. Humphries a bit of extended time given his
extended tenure as our President and CEO.

We're in the question and answer phase, and we'll
take questions at this time or comments from members
of the Board.

Board, any questions of Dr. Humphries and/or
Dr. Lewis?

TRUSTEE LAWSON: I do and it's one of those and I
think any of the former presidents can answer. But I
think one thing I would say as Vice Chair, and this is
late, and it is terribly inspiring to hear the
presidents through the years talk about their
experience and their leadership and the things they
accomplish at this university, extremely inspiring and
we appreciate the time you guys have taken today to do
this.

But the question I have is around collaborative
relationships. You had to have that, be it with the
Board of Regions, whether it be with your staff, whether it be with your Board of Trustees.

Talk to us about that. Talk to us about how you see a situation moving forward and growing in that space.

FORMER PRESIDENT LEWIS: Let me say a couple of things. I think as a Board, you have to know all of the staff at the University. One of the things I do on all of the Boards I serve on is and when I served as Interim President, I brought one or two Deans to each meeting for you to hear from that Dean and what he or she was doing in his or her college. And when we would have board dinners, I brought the Deans and the vice-presidents there for you to interact with them socially, because you have to know the face. If you see a Dean of Pharmacy in the airport, you want to know him in that regard.

So having that interpersonal interaction puts you a little more in touch where they're going with their school of college, and how they intend to get there. We did not want them to try and lobby you for any particular thing, but to get to know you socially, because unless you know -- you only got some hours that you're on campus, so you've got to know who is running what and how well they're doing so when you
see something from a positive perspective you have to
act on, you have a little more background than I have
standing up here at the podium, to negotiate at your
board meeting.

FORMER PRESIDENT HUMPHRIES: Look, just as been
stated, y'all we have 14 colleges at FAMU. I guess we
got over 200 majors and disciplines, right, and we get
money from everywhere. We get land grant money. We
get money from the National Science Foundation. We
get money from NIH. We have membership in external
organizations and those memberships in internal
organizations are important because they deal with the
subject matter. Take what Henry was saying about the
pharm-D. That was the pharm-D got addressed at the
national level when the Provost and vice-president of
that organization, Provost from the University of
Washington, Washington State, UCLA, Cal Berkley,
Northwestern, Minnesota; all of those schools were in
the discussion on making the decision about whether
higher education was going to require as the
entry-level degree for pharmacists the pharm-D.

The pharmacy companies all around the country
wanted only to have a baccalaureate degree because the
baccalaureate degree was cheaper. They pay less.
Pharm-D was going to cost them more. So they did not
want Henry and them deciding to have the pharm-D as the entry requirement, so.

So if you want to have an impact on those discussions, you got to be able to get along with the people who are the leaders of the Provost, and you have got to read the stuff, and you have got to go to have prepared discussion if you want your thought and your input to count, okay?

Now, at the Board's staff relationship with board members. I think that for your committee structure, that the staff person designated by the President has to have a close working relationship with the chairs of those committees, and they've got to make sure that chairs of the committees are well-informed and know what they're doing when they conduct their meeting and what the major issues are. I mean, that has to be a close relationship. If it's a scary relationship and the person on the staff is backing off from any kind of closeness, then you're not going to have a working committee.

You got to be able to get along, communicate, and help you do your job as a committee chair. For us, when I used to we would go -- we were under the Board of Regions. We went to a board meeting. I carried all of my institutional offices, Provost Vice-
President For Academic Affairs, Vice-President for
Student Affairs, the auditor; they all went and they
knew that their whole goal was to have conversation
with other people like them on other campuses, but
also talk to the staff person at the Board to find out
what the hell is going on.

So everybody had a defined responsibility. We
would discuss that. Now, what you should be -- and
excuse me for putting it this way -- what you should
be acutely aware of, almost no public black college
gets a fair evaluation in a centralized system, okay?
It just don't. The people -- it's always worse when
they talk to you about a problem. Your problem is
always worse than everybody else's. Don't you, as a
Board, find yourself doing the same thing to the
University, making it worse than it really is, right?

You know, like you said, Mr. Chairman, I was
President a long time, and I have a lot of experiences
and one is -- here's what I learned to do. One is we,
hired a guy who had been accused of assaulting a young
lady, and it had been worked out and forgiven and all
of that and we hired him as an associate Dean.

And a board member called me, a Board of Regions
member called me and he jumped all over me. He said,
"How dare you bring into our community a felon who is
assaulted a young lady, and you now you're going to
bring him in to the Tallahassee community?"

So that guy was let go, but here's what I did. I
sent my research team to look at all of the newspapers
in the states to find out what had happened at our
sister institution when a situation like that came up.
And low and behold, we found South Florida with a
pedophile that worked in the Department of Family and
Children at South Florida. He came from Tallahassee.
He was found guilty of 7 pedophilic indiscretions.

He left Tallahassee and went to Tampa, and that
was brought up at South Florida, and the people
defended him, and he's still working till today. So
when I got the newspaper clippings on this, I called
the board guy, and said, "I want to come down and see
you," and I carried these clips of this guy who had
had committed 7 pedophilic indiscretions and I gave it
to him.

So I said, "What did you do about that? Hell,
you couldn't wait to call me about a guy who had been
cleared of an assault, and I want to know, did you
call Betty Casto and did you tell her she needs to get
rid of -- how dare she bring into the Tampa community
a person who had committed seven pedophilic
indiscretions?" And he said, "No, I didn't say that
to Betty. I just said, 'Hey, Betty what you doing about that?' and left it alone." He ain't jump on her or nothing.

Well, that's mostly the case. If you come up with an audit exception like Fred was into me -- someone at FAMU stealing -- if you come up with stuff like that and you can't account for something, somebody is taking it. So you've got to know that the outside world always makes more vicious the act when it comes to us.

And all I know how to do to combat that -- one more little story. All of us who live in our communities, when we get the newspaper and there is something reported on black people, we all know that's exaggerated and got problems and we know that. So now, we can have a newspaper and something about your university and you don't apply that; you don't think this external world will treat FAMU different.

So we had some stuff in the newspaper, and they had sent people up to Detroit to meet with the alumni, and there's some stuff that a period of Tallahassee Democrat and people in the alumni sent copies of the paper up to Detroit and all of the worse, right?

So when I got to speak to them, I was like, "Have y'all forgotten before you get angry and all worked
up, what the situation is for us?" You know that they
treated that worse? And so now, I'm here, and I can
tell you what happened, but you don't need to form
conclusions about it because it's going to always --
if you believe it, it's going to be worse and you're
going to think the worse of us for it.

I was going to London, to Oxford, and I was
saying good-bye, and we had a big national conference
for the national alumni in Orlando, and it came out
that one of our persons in financial aid had taken
about $35,000. We self-reported that, because we
discovered it and then we self-reported it, so the way
the paper wrote, you know, "those bad people at FAMU
and now stealing money."

Well, at the same time that this young lady was
involved in taking $35,000 over at FSU -- got stole
and it wasn't as much noise about that my compared to
the 35,000. And so when I got up to give my speech, I
said, "Hell, we are packers; we only take a little bit
of money. Those folks over at FSU steal big, a
million dollars, and I want y'all to see -- I want
y'all to treat them like you treat us when we take a
little bit of money and you want to throw us under the
jail and we no longer have any rights."

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: There's a Democrat reporter
right over there, Dr. Humphries.

FORMER PRESIDENT HUMPHRIES: I know Byron.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: We're going to wrap this up. Any remaining questions, concerns, comments, members of the Board?

On this, Mr. Presidents, we all thank you. Dr. Bryant couldn't be here with us here today, but Dr. Humphries and Dr. Lewis, thank you again for your segment as we bring this session of the agenda to a close.

Our next agenda item is comments from the board liaison to the Strategic Planning Task Force and that's Kelvin Lawson. I believe we had an item earlier and you simply moved it to the part of --

TRUSTEE LAWSON: Yeah. So quickly, I'll be brief on both of these. The first one is to the last comments on strategic planning. I think we have discussed that in detail. I think we're pleased with the progress that we're making all the way now.

Two brief comments. I think after all of the legwork that Dr. Robinson and his team completed, I think we're comfortable where we are. We still have a lot more work to do, as far as the team is considered and overall comfort with the board level engagement.

You know, we had put one other topic on the
agenda, guys, and as a Vice Chair, I feel remissed if
we didn't at least take a couple of minutes. I know
it's late in the evening so I won't be long. 5.2.1 of
our Board Statute allows us to add agenda items as
appropriate. This is truly a business meeting because
we have a full quorum. I'll be brief in my comments.

As I stated earlier, we have gone through the
presidential evaluation. There were -- we know what
the reviews were so I won't review that.

I think as a Board we do need to discuss our
concerns, if we still have them, and I say "if."

I'll tell you mine quickly. They continue to
rely or lie in the areas of communication, and they
continue to lie in the areas of what I call full
transparency.

We have heard the discussion on the engineering
school and we have heard the criticality of where that
budget lies and doesn't lie today. We have heard
recommendations today on where it should lie. We all
saw the work plan, and everybody has an opinion on the
work plan, and I have some serious concerns about the
funding or lack thereof, of the ability to achieve --

Can I please have your attention, audience? If
you need to step outside, it probably would be
appropriate, sir.
Thank you.

At this point, I do want to just make sure I register my concerns with the Board. There may not be others. I feel like I have adequately done that; if there are others, Mr. Chair, I would love to entertain them.

TRUSTEE GRABLE: Mr. Chair, I feel it's important. I heard something on NPR yesterday -- last week -- it talks about leadership leads at the pace that the followers are willing to follow.

I sent and distributed to the Board a letter that was sent to my office, and I sent that out a couple of weeks ago. Board members may recall it was anonymous letter, but as a scholar, as a trained PhD, I feel it is really important that all voices be heard. That's how we operate in America, that all voices have a chance to be heard.

This particular letter outlines some concern expressed by anonymous members of the faculty, and I felt that it was important enough that board members see that and that I also share it when the Board had a chance to get together to discuss items like this. And these concerns -- I will be quick, of course -- include the fact that one of the issues discussed in our last committee meeting on the Faculty Senate, was
again, a lack of faculty representation on committees. And I have had a chance to mention that to Dr. Mangum, as well as the Provost.

But one that still seems to remain out there, and the steering committee members have suggested that I address this even in a stronger way, was the lack of faculty having access on the Dean's counsel. That concerned the steering committee members quite a bit.

We were told that the Provost would prefer to be able to talk to the Deans outside of faculty members being in of the room. But the tradition here at the University has been that faculty members were not only represented on the Dean's counsel, but that the Faculty Senate President, whomever that may be, would also have representation on the leadership team. And I have not discussed that; I will be honest with the President.

But I think it's important that we understand what the traditions have been, what the conventions have been. And our Academic Constitution suggests that we have two faculty member representatives on all committees and that would include counsels, et cetera. So that is of a concern -- I happen to know -- right now with the steering committee members, and I look forward to have be an opportunity to further discuss
that at the administrative level. But the
constitution is very clear about that and it is
important that we all follow the Academic
Constitution. There is no question. This letter also
addresses the issue of retribution where in recent
weeks we've had some realignment, and I'll use the
word "firing" of quite a few people in the alumni and
Foundation area. And the fact that the letter, as
well as I think about some of the comments I've
received, that we have not heard from the faculty at
all, but there are some concerns about speaking
publicly. So that is my job to make sure that all
voices come to the marketplace to be heard and vetted
fairly.

That, along with the issue many of you may have
read, regarding the Florida A&M University, FAMU and
Journey student editors. I cannot tell you how
extensive that conversation was in the School of
Journalism. That was a big issue. Students are still
coming to various faculty members attempting to
address that issue as well. Not to mention, the
issues of shame that I have heard faculty members
mention in regard to some of the recent press
attention.

We just want to be able to have a fair say as
faculty and a -- an environment where everybody gets
to express their opinions whether they are liked by me
or by anybody else who is a member of the board.

These are very important issues as we listen to
the Presidents talk about the fact that share in the
governing of the University. The University
Constitution is very clear on that, that the Faculty
Senate and members of the faculty has a right to
address general issues of concern that come up at the
University. And I think that when you board members
have looked through that letter, you will see that
faculty exclusion from input has been a concern -- I
know it has been through our steering committee with
the Faculty Senate -- and in some cases people even
use the word disrespect as was used in this letter.

I already mentioned the word of embarrassment,
and of course, there was a concern. And a lot of
those things, you may recall, I did mention in my own
evaluation, so this is really not news. But I know
there would be some concern that this is an anonymous
letter, but if that's the way faculty members who sent
this letter to me -- I don't know who it was -- then I
think we have to keep in mind that the constituency
will find a way to share a message and that we -- my
job as a faculty representative is to share those
concerns at the level of the board.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Trustee Grable.

Any additional questions, concerns, comments, members of the Board?

TRUSTEE McWILLIAMS: I have one comment on that. I read the letter; I was very impressed with the concerns. I'm just, to be honest, I'm never real impressed with anonymous anything. I think that we all would still be on the back of the bus if we were that scared to stand up and say something.

So we all have some vulnerability, and if you're not willing to take a risk -- if you feel that strongly about it -- I just don't think it's that important.

So I would encourage faculty or anybody else to stand up and say what you got to say. If you believe in Florida A&M and you're concerned about what's going on here, just stand up and tell us and we can respect that.

TRUSTEE MOORE: Mr. Chair, I would echo the same comment on that. I mean, certainly there should be a line between what is known as a valid and factual concern, versus those that come through an anonymous route. That's not to say there might be some validity
to it, but I agree we should have a filter as a body; otherwise, we would be chasing everything that comes at us.

TRUSTEE GRABLE: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Trustee Grable.

TRUSTEE GRABLE: I respect the comments of Trustee McWilliams and Trustee Moore, but I think it is really also important, and I think Trustee Moore kind of hit on it; I don't know if any member found anything in the letter that would have been invalidated, and that I think, is a key point to keep in mind.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Okay, any additional?

TRUSTEE LAWSON: I do have one additional comment. I think that as a part of -- and I don't know if it fits into maybe the work plan or some way other than the strategic plan, but I would like to see us make an active pitch, for lack of a better term, to regain budget authority for the School of Engineering. I feel that we have had enough dialogue about that during the performance review. We had enough about dialogue about that probably in other venues. You heard some of the historical significance of why it was placed that way so, you know, I would ask that our administration take that as a to-do moving forward.
And you know, as I think it through I'm not sure if it fits in the work plan. It may fit in the work plan because the work plan is a little shorter than the strategic plan, but I do think for a number of reasons that I won't repeat, we have to say that.

And I also think that as a board, as we, you know, sit around this table -- and I think Dr. Humphries said it best, we own a lot of these issues. They are ours, and if we choose to do nothing about them, that's also our responsibility.

So I feel as an individual I have voiced my concerns, and I hope those are registered, and I hope I did it in an appropriate fashion without any specifics ties to any individual person, et cetera.

But I think that there are still concerns that need to be addressed, and I feel as a board, it is our responsibility to do those things. I am hopeful moving forward that each of us will take that and do the things that we collectively feel need to be done to address some of the concerns that again have been ongoing concerns. These are not new concerns.

So I'll leave that as my final close, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Members of the Board have not had an opportunity to speak. Hearing that, Trustee Graham and then Trustee McWilliams.
Trustee Graham: Thank you. After the fruitful conversations today, I just want to know where your head is at, Madam President? What's your feedback and take on everything from the history and strategic planning and just your view on things moving forward?

President Mangum: Well, thanks for asking the question. I have a lot of comments to make but I'll make them brief.

The history was the history. There is different points in time, different political situations, and clearly different people around the board. The challenges that face to me when I came to this administration, and many of the previous presidents talked about the stacks of the university and the challenges that they had. The political climate is different in each one of their administrations and certainly different from the one that I am involved in right now. That includes a lack of jobs, lack of educational opportunities, shortage of funding, a university full of students that came not ready to succeed based upon an FTE model to receive funding, because the state had decided it wasn't going to fund Florida A&M, from what they said and they made decisions around the funding model that exists.

I believe President Ammons outlined the fact that
the performance funding model is not based upon input but based upon output. We did our analysis looking at the work plan where we saw FAMU's best, six-year graduation rates were at 47 percent. So a lot of students came, we have 70,000 alumns; half of those probably graduated from the institution in six years according to the data.

A part of what we saw during the strategic planning process was we talked about predictive analytics. Predictive analytics can attract students to your institution if you provide the quality in what they're looking for. Part of that quality has to be exhibited in your graduates and also in your graduation rates. Many people look at the graduation rates as a metrics to determining what their students would consider going to an institution.

So we talked about the college readiness is different now, the qualities of people that students are looking for at other institutions, and the fact that they are recruiting students with high achievement scores puts them in an interesting position. Because we're not having the outcomes that are attracting those students.

We also know that many of the students that we attract is going to -- and traditionally attempted to
attract come from environment in the K-12 system where
they actually under-prepared, even if they do make the
test scores. I think one of the presidents also noted
that income is a better predictor of student success
in college. We find that to be true, and that's in
all of the national data and all of the national
statistics that we have.

So, we're recruiting in a different world, we're
recruiting with different expectations. We're at an
environment now where people are pursuing science,
technology, engineering and math, and all of the
majors that support those activities. It's quite a
big difference from some of the more historical ways
to recruit, even though Dr. Humphries made a valiant
effort to recruit students in science, engineering and
math, but that's because other people weren't letting
them in their schools either.

So there are a lot of environmental conditions
surrounding their success, at least in getting
students to come into the institution, but I think the
record shows that our ability to graduate those
students has been pretty steady over the last 20 years
or 25 years, in fact. The climate has changed quite a
bit with regard to education, and in the United States
especially with regards to the score cards and other
With regard to financial aid, aid packages, we've started on a path for efficiency and effectiveness. The vice-presidents that are here have worked to become more efficient. I think this is the first year we've got financial aid ahead of time and packaged before the students actually left the institution. We have asked donors to support our students to help with help us with those metrics in the gifts that we received, so we provided incentives for student to help themselves as part of the process.

We've also reorganized student advising and student success as part of the institution to help those students that came, that don't know how to go to college and don't know how to graduate. So we are actually trying to provide the support for the students that admitted that weren't ready. They didn't have that before to the degree we were admitting them and so that's something we're doing.

So we believe as a team we are addressing the most critical needs of the students at this institution at this time. There's a lot of work that needs to be done in order for us to meet the normalized metrics that the State of Florida has set, but we believe that we can do it. I know there's not
a lot of confidence in us being able to do it because we've never done it. But I believe that people that we have hired are willing to put themselves in a position and hire people that are committed to the community students, because we believe in putting the students first, and that's what we're doing.

The other thing that I would say with regard to resources, because we're in a resource environment that pays based upon productivity; we don't have the resources to invest back in the way we would like to. We offer the two percent. That's what we had. That's more than what we had; since not getting any resources for the year for the faculty salary increased as a whole, we did reorganize our resources to pull money to try and meet some of the faculty salary needs.

Re-examining the administrative processes with regard research to change the policies with regard to faculty being able to pay themselves from research activity is something that VP of Research is working on, as well as the Provost, to say, if you get the research grant, you can write salary in for yourself and you can give yourself salary; you can provide additional salary compensation for yourself.

So the energy crisis is another area. When we talk about responding to the market, we have a full
crisis -- energy crisis and agriculture crisis -- and
we're trying to push our agriculture programs and the
research associated with it to the forefront and get
outside sponsorship for activities that we know the
world needs. So hence, the internationalization,

hence the relationships with members of the

agriculture department, inviting them here, getting
the land, getting our students interested in something
that's going to give them a career and a certain

future. It's what we're doing.

There is a lot in 18 months, especially in the

conditions that we find ourselves in so it's a
challenge, but all of the presidents before you had
challenges, and all of them left here in interesting
kinds of conditions because they were visionary enough
to see where the University had to go and fight to
take it there. Every one of them had to fight to get
their agendas approved. So we're committed to
continuing to push the agenda, to define the vision,
and strategically help the university community and
all of our stakeholders plan to get us there.

So that's kind of what I heard them say and
that's -- it fits right along with what we're doing in
today's environment.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Trustee McWilliams.
McWilliams, I just want to know whether or not that was something that we need to suggest to President Mangum regarding the item that Vice Chair mentioned. The budget, the engineering school budget; you're saying something about asking to look into it?

PRESIDENT MANGUM: After understanding your views on that, we took it back to the joint counsel the last time. We'll take it back to the joint council and put it on the table. The conditions of which we got to this position are considerably different from what they were when Dr. Humphries and Dr. Ammons and even when Dr. Robinson was leaving the position.

When I came in, on the second day, there was -- it was introduced -- the School of Engineering was introduced to the Legislature to be taken away from Florida A&M University, so that was my first introduction to the engineering argument. So it wasn't as if it was a budget issue: It was a school issue.

And I will say, and I've said it before, and I think Dr. Humphries also stated. The value of engineering to any institution that wants to survive and be a player in higher education in the future, engineering is essential. Every place you go -- the National Action Council For Minority Engineers, and
every business person in America will tell you that we need more engineers and everybody wants more minority engineers. So to be out of that place at all would be a travesty for Florida A&M University, so maintaining our presence in that space. What we're trying to do is we're grasping at straws, to be honest with you. So the students and the faculty and members of the engineering faculty mobilized to be able to keep the engineering school at Florida A&M University, to a point where the Legislature commissioned the study, paid $500,000 to commission the study to talk about the value of having this type of relationship. Coming out of it, everyone agreed to have a joint council, joint management council, to oversee college of engineering. That joint management council includes four people from FAMU, four people from FSU -- the leadership teams basically and the Chancellor of the system.

We can put any issue on the table. The issue of the budget and who it manages, the budget was an issue on the table. Because of the history that was shown in the study of FAMU's management of the budget, there were several questions about the quality of budget management over 32 years. The way that FAMU got to a position during this 32-year position, where FSU's
engineering side of the budget was so much better or
side of the school was quality and was so much better
and so much more robust, they believed they could
separate and be accredited. FAMU could not. That was
clear that FAMU could not be separate and accredited
without FSU. All of the advisors across the country
that I've talked to regarding engineering education
suggested that it would not be a good idea, and I
think Dr. Humphries said a same thing, to separate
from FSU with regard to engineering. That wasn't the
feedback I got from individual people I talked to
through Florida A&M Board members at the time, but
collectively we agreed that it was a good idea. We
agreed to the joint council.

The joint council wanted to take the budget away,
as part of our negotiations and discussions, because
we had control of the budget for 32 years, we agreed
to rotate. We had two choices: We could have agreed
to rotate, or the budget was going to get moved,
because we have 4 out of 9 votes. And it was clear
from all of the studies and all of the history as far
as the processes and procedures were concerned that we
were not in the best position to take on all of what
FSU has been doing with their budget, because they
have as much budget outside of the joint college
that's working towards the College of Engineering as
they do in it, as far as their share is concerned.

So having the Dean rotate to Florida A&M was a
way for us to be able to build our capacity in
engineering. So if we go back -- and we will because
you said so if that's your direction -- we can go back
and pursue asking them to give us a budget to do the
mechanics, the accounting, and they take the
leadership of the academic programs, we'll be probably
like we've been for the last 32 years.

We ended up on the short end of that stick.

TRUSTEE McWILLIAMS: But not for the whole 32
years. I think during Humphries' Administration, we
had a lot more students than what we have.

PRESIDENT MANGUM: But this is where we ended
right now. This is where we are.

TRUSTEE McWILLIAMS: But it wasn't because we had
the budget. We didn't end up that way because we
weren't managing the budget.

PRESIDENT MANGUM: Right. You ended that way
because you had the Dean. You didn't have the Dean.
The Dean controls the academic processes.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: I'll say this, and the
Board can say, based on what Trustee Lawson said. I
was on campus for seven hours before this vote was
taken, and as Chairman of the Board, you have to talk to your Board and tell them what's going on. If anyone disagrees with that, speak up, members of the Board.

I think what's being expressed is policy belong to the Board and we have the responsibility, as the governing body; to maintain our accreditation, we have maintain institutional control. Policy decisions are not made by the administration; they're made by the board. And so, members of the Board, with regard to how we move, if there's a motion, Trustee Lawson; however, y'all moved it.

But my concern is, moving forward, this same type of action could be taken without coming to us, so if you're silent about $13 million per year being moved without consultation with the Board, no consultation with board leadership; if you condone that behavior, then if it happens again, you might as well go ahead and remain silent.

So with that said, it is a concern, the request at least on my end is, hey, we're eyes-in, hands-out, but we need to know what's going on.

So you have to communicate with your Board so we can make the informed decision to support what's going on in the best interest of the institution.
But with that --

PRESIDENT MANGUM: May I make one more --

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: Please.

But with that said, there was a concern raised by

Trustee Lawson. There was a follow-up by Trustee

McWilliams. We're not going to engage in a back-

and-forth here, and I wanted to make sure any Trustee

who had questions or concerns was able to address it

at this point and then we will move forward.

Was there any additional Trustees who did have

crains?

Okay. Hearing no additional -- our closing

remarks on the agenda were that we had our meeting

today. I thought it was productive. I hope you did

as well. There will be, obviously, the survey that

Dr. Robinson and the team have distributed to members

of the board for input, so I encourage you all to

complete those in the spirit of helping move this

ting forward.

We have committee meetings on the 28th, as a

trecap, and we will have a discussion in the Governance

Committee about operating procedures. I think at this

point it is required. The other committees will also

meet. So in the spirit of what was discussed earlier,

it's obvious, and we shouldn't have to vote to require
staff to engage members of the communities or what have you.

So to the extent you can coordinate with the board liaison, we do have an expectation that senior staff will communicate with the members of the committees for the 28th. Also, I'm encouraging full attendance at the Board of Governors' meeting in November. There's a trustee summit that will be held concurrently. I found those to be very helpful, and the takeaways at those summits really aren't from the presentations but the opportunity to interact with counter-parts at other institutions. At least, I personally have found those to be the best part and the interactions. It's back to something that Trustee Graham mentioned -- I think it was in a break-out session today -- but knowing what's going on at other institutions and seeing what's going on, it's a big help.

Finally, we will have a joint meeting in Orlando with the Board of Trustees, the FAMU Foundation and the National Alumni Association Executive Board. I think you're aware and familiar, we encourage your attendance there. And it will be a regular board meeting as scheduled. All we did is move our December meeting -- all of us come to the Classic, seven or
eight trustees by my count last year -- and then two
weeks later to come back to Orlando. We're just
combining it to be more efficient in terms of how we
moving this thing forward.

I thank the Foundation for providing the space,
members of the administration to help facilitate use
of the space, and hopefully it was a great use of your
time. And if there are board members on the phone,
any questions, concerns, comments?

Hearing none --

TRUSTEE ALSTON:  I'm on, Mr. Chairman. Sorry,
nothing from me.

CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY:  Hearing nothing additional
from the members of the Board, this meeting is
adjourned.

(Off the record at 5:36 p.m.)
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