

Florida A&M University
Board of Trustees Special Committee on FAMU DRS
Meeting Minutes

Date	June 2, 2026
Time	Approximately 4:00 p.m. ET; recordings include the main committee meeting and related breakout/work-team session.
Format	Zoom / webinar-style meeting with separate work-team breakout links
Presiding	Dr. Jamal A. Brown, Chair
Purpose	Continue organizing the Special Committee work teams, identify information needed from FAMU DRS and the Superintendent, conduct preliminary work-team discussions, and prepare members for the June 11, 2026 Board of Trustees meeting.

1. Attendance / Participants

- Participants noted in the transcripts included Dr. Jamal A. Brown, Chair; Trustee Roderick Harris; Joseph Maleszewski; Rodrick D. Jones; Kimberly Taylor; Brandi Tatum-Fedrick; Dr. William Hudson Jr.; Dr. Benny L. Bolden Jr.; Dr. Jesse Jackson; Dr. Courtney Wright; Sylvester Peck; Roger L. Walker; Vaughn Wilson; LaTonya Baker; Isis Dukes; Altony Lee; and meeting-support accounts. Additional members may have been present but were not clearly identified in the transcript.
- The meeting operated as a working session. No formal motions, seconds, or votes were recorded.

2. Opening Context and Purpose of the Session

- Chair Brown opened by asking each work team to identify the specific data, documents, or other information needed from the Superintendent, FAMU DRS administration, or university offices. The purpose was to organize requests in a coordinated manner and support team-level work without duplicating information that may be produced through the KPMG engagement.
- The discussion centered on translating the committee charter and work-team duties into actionable assignments. Chair Brown emphasized that members should leave the meeting knowing the content area they are responsible for researching and should begin preparing recommendations for later committee review and eventual Board consideration.

3. Information Requested for KPI, Governance, and School Performance Work

- Team 1 and related participants identified several data needs tied to the committee’s KPI, accountability, governance, and school-performance charge. Dr. Bolden requested detail on students counted in learning gains, particularly the bottom 25%, and asked for information on the number of middle-school students taking accelerated courses such as Algebra, Geometry, Biology, and Earth/Space Science. This information was framed as important to understanding the acceleration pipeline and the potential relationship between middle-school course-taking and later AA/college pathway readiness.
- Joseph Maleszewski noted that Teams 1 and 4 are likely to be informed by the forthcoming KPMG work product and cautioned against duplicating information requests that may already be in progress. Chair Brown stated that he would gather the broader data requests, compare them with what KPMG provides, and then identify any gaps that remain.
- Student-population consistency from year to year, including whether school-grade snapshots reflect the same students over time.
- Attendance, truancy, chronic absenteeism, and the level of granularity behind figures such as students missing more than 10% of school days.
- Correlation among attendance, discipline, out-of-school suspension, repeat violations, and academic performance.
- Intervention or recourse processes when students have high absenteeism, including the role of faculty, administration, family support, social work, and community partners.
- Specific dashboard fields, reporting templates, schedule of updates, data custodians, and the format in which information should be transmitted for dashboard development.
- Members discussed the School Improvement Plan as a source that contains some attendance, suspension, referral, and grade-level information. However, members also stated that the committee needs more detailed data than annual snapshots provide, especially for understanding the students and conditions behind the numbers.

4. Academic Quality, Staffing, Certification, and Professional Development

- Dr. Courtney Wright requested the current evaluation and accountability framework used for school staff and administrators, including the framework for teacher support, instructional quality, professional development, academic performance, and plans for staff development. Chair Brown suggested that student, faculty, and staff handbooks, plus available policies, may provide part of the framework, but Dr. Wright clarified that professional development should be requested separately because training and staff support may not be fully captured in handbooks.
- Dr. Jackson requested staff-retention data and noted that student attendance and performance issues may intersect with adult attendance, teacher continuity, and staff longevity. Dr. Jackson and Dr. Bolden explained that a staffing plan should do more than list names; it should indicate whether teachers are in-field or out-of-field, the subject and courses assigned, years of experience, degree levels, and whether teachers are certified in the areas in which they are providing instruction.
- The committee discussed particular concern for secondary “singleton” courses such as Algebra, Geometry, Biology, U.S. History, and other graduation-required or tested courses. Members asked whether the current staffing documents show if a teacher has

enough sections in the certified area, whether teachers are assigned outside certification areas, and whether there is a tracking mechanism for teacher attendance, new-teacher support, on-campus and off-campus professional development, and certification alignment.

- Sylvester Peck provided historical context from his long tenure at DRS, noting that teacher retention has been affected by salary competitiveness and living standards. He also stated that sustained high performance requires stability, leadership, subject-matter expertise, and a team that remains together long enough to build momentum.

5. Work-Team Structure and Expected Deliverables

- Chair Brown clarified that the work teams are intended to operate as smaller “buckets” of responsibility. Members are expected to research assigned duties, study models that are working in Leon County, surrounding districts, State University System peers, Florida College System partners, and lab-school peers, and return with concrete recommendations.
- Chair Brown described the process as building recommendations piece by piece. Teams should identify data, models, options, and proposed recommendations; present those items to the larger committee for discussion; refine them as needed; and then package viable recommendations for the Board of Trustees committee structure and the full Board.
- Team 1: KPI, accountability, governance, school-performance metrics, dashboard structure, reporting templates, data sources, and SUS-aligned pathway metrics.
- Team 2: Academic quality, instruction, internships, College of Education alignment, teacher-support frameworks, certification, professional development, and early-childhood models.
- Teams 3-6: Continue work on college/career pathways, finance/facilities/sustainability, research/innovation/pilot programs, and community/alumni engagement, with assignments to be refined through team-level work.
- Chair Brown referenced specific members beginning or continuing particular areas of work, including VP Jones on dashboard/data architecture; Dr. Bolden on academic and KPI-related areas; Dr. Wright on early-childhood education and College of Education alignment; and Dr. Jackson on advisory-board and governance-related areas based on prior experience.

6. Breakout / Webinar Work-Team Discussion: Dashboard and Data Infrastructure

- After the opening discussion, participants were directed to separate team links. Members with one team assignment were asked to stay in that room for approximately 30 minutes, while members assigned to two teams were asked to spend roughly 15 minutes in each room.
- In the Team 1 discussion, members reviewed the need to assign owners to the primary duty areas and determine whether the dashboard should be built electronically from the ground up or modeled from existing systems. Kimberly Taylor described a district-level dashboard that captures data such as demographics, schedules, class offerings, teacher assignments, discipline, PM assessment data, grades, and attendance. She indicated that dashboard data can be exported to Excel or converted for presentation use.
- Rodrick D. Jones emphasized the importance of identifying the data points, data sets, data sources, and data-retrieval process before determining whether a consolidated dashboard can be created. The group discussed whether FAMU DRS currently has a data-entry and reporting infrastructure that can produce real-time or near-real-time data, and whether the school’s use of FOCUS or another platform can feed a dashboard.
- Members agreed that the committee should not only request final outcomes, but should understand the infrastructure behind the outcomes. Topics included who collects and uploads data, whether school or university IT supports the process, how often data are refreshed, which data can be downloaded, and how board/advisory reporting could be made more timely and useful. The group discussed the value of real-time or quarterly data related to PM assessments, attendance, grades, discipline, master schedules, and school-grade indicators.

7. Partnerships, External Models, and Community Context

- Trustee Harris raised the community-partnership-school model as a possible area for study and asked what supports are available for students whose absenteeism or performance may reflect conditions outside school. Chair Brown connected this question to the need for an inventory of existing university and community resources, including College of Education partnerships, campus-based programs, nonprofit partners, and potential outside entities that could support DRS.
- Dr. Jackson shared experience from Florida High and described how lab-school structures, budget-management models, and external partnerships can affect school operations. He noted that DRS historically appeared to manage certain budget matters through the central university structure rather than as a more independent school-district operation, which he viewed as a potential complication. He also described prior educator-recruitment and internship efforts involving FAMU, Flagler, and local schools as a model for keeping strong candidates in the Tallahassee area.
- Dr. Jackson and Sylvester Peck also discussed the importance of reputation, history, and community confidence in fundraising and partnership development. Mr. Peck emphasized that FAMU High/FAMU DRS has a long history and should be treated as an institution worthy of sustained investment and renewed expectations.

8. Board Meeting Preparation, Communications, and Closing Direction

- Chair Brown reminded members that there would not be another Special Committee meeting before the June 11, 2026 Board of Trustees meeting. Members were asked to mark their calendars, tune in or attend as able, and remain attentive because some of the team framework and committee work would be discussed at that meeting.
- Chair Brown stated that the next Special Committee meeting would be scheduled after the Board meeting. In the meantime, members should continue working on their assigned areas and prepare to return with research, models, suggestions, and draft recommendations. When a document or recommendation is ready for broader review, members may send it to Chair Brown and/or Kimberly Taylor for circulation to the committee.

- The committee also discussed voluntary sharing of contact information among members to allow coordination outside formal meetings. Chair Brown stated that any shared contact list would be used internally and that members could choose the level of contact information they were comfortable sharing. Isis Dukes asked about communications outside the meeting and public-record considerations; Chair Brown clarified that the immediate charge is for members to work on individual tasks and bring materials back to the committee.

9. Consolidated Information Requests Identified During the Meeting

The following matrix consolidates the main information needs raised in the main meeting and the related breakout discussion. The items are not final recommendations; they are inputs needed for the teams to conduct analysis and prepare recommendations.

Area	Information Requested	Purpose / Use
Student acceleration / pipeline	Bottom 25% learning-gain students; middle-school enrollment in accelerated courses; 7th-grade Earth/Space Science; Algebra, Geometry, Biology, and other acceleration indicators.	Clarify whether DRS students are being moved into college/career pathway readiness early enough to support AA completion, FAMU entry, and SUS-aligned pathway metrics.
Attendance / truancy	Student attendance, chronic absenteeism, truancy details, grade-level attendance patterns, and students missing more than 10% of days.	Understand whether absenteeism is affecting school-grade performance, learning gains, classroom continuity, and intervention needs.
Discipline / student support	Suspension, OSS, referral, repeat-violation, and intervention data; correlation with attendance and academics.	Determine whether discipline patterns, student-support needs, or family circumstances are contributing to academic outcomes.
Staffing / certification	Staffing plan with course assignments, in-field/out-of-field status, certification alignment, singletons, experience, degree levels, vacancies, absences, and retention.	Assess whether instructional quality and tested/graduation-required courses are supported by certified and stable personnel.
Professional development / accountability	Evaluation framework, administrator and teacher-support framework, professional-development cadence, new-teacher support, and student/faculty/staff handbooks.	Determine whether school personnel receive the coaching, training, and accountability needed to close identified gaps.
Dashboard / reporting	Dashboard fields, data owners, data sources, update schedule, reporting templates, FOCUS exports, PM data, attendance, discipline, grades, master schedule, and IT support.	Create a practical reporting structure that can support real-time or quarterly committee, Board, and advisory reporting.
Partnerships / external supports	Inventory of university, College of Education, nonprofit, STEM, internship, community-partnership, social-work, and external support resources.	Identify existing and potential supports that could be aligned to student needs, teacher pipeline, wraparound services, and DRS innovation.
KPMG coordination	KPMG report and associated governance/risk-discovery findings, especially for Teams 1 and 4.	Avoid duplicative requests, use KPMG findings as a baseline, and identify remaining information gaps for committee work.

10. Action Items and Follow-Up

#	Responsible Party	Follow-Up Item
1	Chair Brown / Kimberly Taylor	Send follow-up communication to members, including next-meeting information after the June 11 Board meeting and instructions for submitting work products.
2	Chair Brown / Kimberly Taylor	Prepare a voluntary internal contact-information process for members who wish to share email and/or phone details for work-team coordination.
3	All work-team members	Confirm individual content areas or primary duties and continue research before the next committee meeting.
4	Team 1 / KPI and Governance	Develop a dashboard/data request framework, including proposed data points, sources, reporting templates, update cadence, and format needs.
5	Team 1 / Chair Brown / Joseph Maleszewski	Compare committee data requests against the forthcoming KPMG work product and identify remaining gaps after KPMG materials are available.
6	Academic Quality / COE Alignment team	Request or review evaluation/accountability framework, professional-development framework, handbooks, staff-support policies, and academic-performance supports.
7	Staffing / Academic Quality reviewers	Request deeper staffing-plan detail, including teacher assignment, in-field/out-of-field status, certification alignment, years of experience, degree levels, absences, retention, and new-teacher support.
8	KPI / Student Support reviewers	Request more granular attendance, truancy, chronic-absence, discipline, OSS, referral, and intervention data, including links to academic performance.
9	Partnership / Community Engagement reviewers	Inventory existing and potential university, College of Education, nonprofit, community-partnership, STEM, internship, and student-support resources that could be aligned with DRS.
10	All members	Attend or monitor the June 11, 2026 Board of Trustees meeting as able and continue preparing research-based recommendations for the next Special Committee meeting.

11. Key Themes to Carry Forward

- Several implementation themes emerged across the main session and breakout discussion. First, members repeatedly emphasized that annual outcome data should be paired with operational data that explain the conditions behind outcomes, including course placement, teacher assignment, attendance, discipline, professional development, and student-support processes.
- Second, the committee discussed the importance of longitudinal analysis. Members requested information that would allow them to understand whether the same students are being tracked over time, how student movement affects school-grade interpretation, and how early academic placement may influence later acceleration and college-readiness outcomes.
- Third, members framed dashboard development as both a governance and management tool. The desired dashboard should not merely reproduce state reports; it should help the committee, school leadership, university leadership, and advisory structures see trends early enough to intervene.
- Fourth, the committee reinforced that DRS should be examined as both a K-12 school and a university-connected developmental school. The discussion connected school improvement to College of Education alignment, university partnerships, teacher pipeline development, research and innovation opportunities, wraparound supports, and FAMU's broader performance and strategic goals.

12. Next Meeting / Adjournment

- The committee was reminded of the June 11, 2026 Board of Trustees meeting. The next Special Committee meeting date was not announced in the transcript and was expected to be scheduled after the Board meeting.
- The meeting and breakout/work-team sessions concluded following closing remarks, expressions of thanks, and reminders for members to continue work in their assigned areas. A formal adjournment motion was not recorded in the transcript.