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TRUSTEE LAWSON: So, members, it looks like Trustee Moore is currently tied up and is not available to come on any earlier than the I believe scheduled 1 o'clock, so as much as I hate to do this, we may have to suspend the committee meetings until 1:00 p.m. because it looks like she is tied up in a work-related situation until at least one. So this gives everybody an opportunity for lunch. If there -- I don't think I'm violating any policy by suspending the meeting and then reconvening at one o'clock. President Mangum and University counsel, are we in compliance if we suspend until one p.m.?

TRUSTEE CARTER: I do have a question. Can we see if the members of the Academic Affairs committee are available and we can move that?

TRUSTEE LAWSON: I'm not sure who that was, but I'd be definitely willing to make an attempt to do that.

TRUSTEE CARTER: This is Trustee Carter. I'm suggesting that we take it out of order.

TRUSTEE LAWSON: Okay. Trustee Carter, so Trustee -- Jenny, if we could determine if we have

Trustee Graham, Shannon, Lawrence, and Dortch, then I'd be more than willing to move that meeting ahead.

TRUSTEE DORTCH: Dortch is on.
TRUSTEE LAWSON: Okay.
TRUSTEE SHANNON: Trustee Shannon is here.
TRUSTEE LAWSON: Shannon is on, okay.
TRUSTEE LAWRENCE: James Lawrence is here.
TRUSTEE LAWSON: All right. So we have a quorum. So, Trustee Carter, if you don't -- if you are up for it, I will relinquish to you as the Chair of the Athletic (sic) Affairs Committee. We will move forward with your Committee, and then we will make an attempt to reconvene with the Special Committee on Presidential Evaluation when Trustee Moore is available.

TRUSTEE CARTER: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And while we're at it, just since we're taking it out of order, our Provost is on her way here, but in the meantime -- okay, so while the Provost is coming down, we can go ahead and proceed with our roll call, please.

Okay. Let me call the roll then. Trustee Carter present.

Trustee Dortch.

TRUSTEE DORTCH: Here.
TRUSTEE CARTER: Trustee Graham. (NO RESPONSE).

TRUSTEE CARTER: Trustee Lawrence.
TRUSTEE LAWRENCE: Here.
TRUSTEE CARTER: Trustee Shannon.
TRUSTEE SHANNON: Here.
TRUSTEE CARTER: Okay. It sounds like we've got a quorum. So you've had an opportunity, members, in the interim to look at the minutes from the December 10, 2015, meeting. Are there any questions or corrections for those minutes?
(NO RESPONSE) .
TRUSTEE CARTER: Hearing none, we'll entertain a motion for adoption, please.

TRUSTEE SHANNON: So moved.
TRUSTEE CARTER: Do we have a second?
TRUSTEE DORTCH: Second.
TRUSTEE CARTER: It's been moved and properly seconded that we approve the minutes from our December 10, 2015 meeting. All those in favor let it be known by the sign of aye.
(AFFIRMATIVE INDICATIONS).
TRUSTEE CARTER: All those opposed.
(NO RESPONSE).

TRUSTEE CARTER: Motion carries unanimously. Now we're getting ready for our action item. First would be tenure upon appointment. Provost David you're recognized.

PROVOST DAVID: Good morning. So tenure upon appointment is the process by which we are able to recruit highly qualified faculty to our campus. It is done in accordance with Article 15-8 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement which states that tenure may be granted to a faculty member by the Board at the time of the initial appointment upon recommendation of the appropriate administrator. In this case, it's the President. The administrator shall consider the recommendation of the department or equivalent unit prior to making his or her final tenure recommendation.

Under our process, we have conferred with the appropriate chairs of the departments of the relevant folks who are being recommended. In one case internally what they then do is also send it up to the Collegiate Committee, Tenure and Appointment Committee, and then there's also a dean's recommendation for each one of these candidates.

They're all listed. Two are from the College
of Education, Doctor Peggy Almond and Sarah Price. Another from the College of Education is Dean Traki Taylor. She is our new dean of the College of Education who started in the middle of January.

We also have from the College of Social Sciences, Arts and Humanities Ray Robertson who is in the political science department.

And finally we have Felicia Epps who is the newly appointed dean of the College of Law, and she started on January the 4 th.

There are short biographies that have been provided in the materials and are available, and I am happy to answer any questions. I reviewed the applications, and then $I$ also reviewed the applications and conferred with the President. These are technically the recommendations of the President, but I think I'm the point person for answering questions if you have any questions.

TRUSTEE CARTER: Are there any questions, members?
(NO RESPONSE).
TRUSTEE CARTER: Then we want to thank the Provost for providing this background information in advance so we'd have an opportunity to review this. I didn't hear any questions, so at this
point in time, we're open for a motion to approve this, all of them together at one time so we need a motion to that effect, please.

TRUSTEE DORTCH: So moved.
TRUSTEE CARTER: It's been moved. Is there a second?

TRUSTEE SHANNON: Second.
TRUSTEE CARTER: All those in favor let it be known by the sign of aye.
(AFFIRMATIVE INDICATIONS).
TRUSTEE CARTER: All those opposed.
(NO RESPONSE).
TRUSTEE CARTER: It passed unanimous.
Madam Provost, you're recognized again for sabbatical and professional development leave.

PROVOST DAVID: Thank you, Chairman Carter.
The sabbatical and professional development leave, this is the policy that provides faculty and -- for development to leave staff members with the opportunity to have time to engage in scholarly research or professional development that will support their activities as faculty or staff respectfully moving forward.

Applications are considered by a sabbatical and professional development leave committee.

There is a competitive process for the bulk of the sabbaticals. There are also sabbaticals that are provided for faculty on a timing basis, after a certain amount of time and being actively engaged in scholarship and teaching.

The recommendations that are presented here have been vetted by the Committee, and the Committee has recommended for professors from the College of Law, Randall Abate; Lily Ann Brown, who is an associate professor in social sciences arts and humanities; Valerie Goodwin, who is in architecture and engineering tech; C. Perry Brown who is in pharmacy and pharmaceutical sciences; Elizabeth Lewis, who is in architecture and engineering technology; Marissa Lewis, who is in allied health sciences; and Alfreda Lorenzo and Mehboob Sheikh who are both in agricultural and food sciences for sabbatical leaves. And then there are professional development leaves that have been recommended for Elizabeth Dawson, who is a research associate in social sciences, arts and humanities.

The description of the projects that have been considered and approved by the Committee follows, and I'm happy to answer any questions.

TRUSTEE CARTER: Members, are there any questions?
(NO RESPONSE).
TRUSTEE CARTER: No question, just from a personal standpoint, I was really exited to see on our -- the research that Doctor Dawson is doing and that it's going to update the history of the University. I noticed, Trustee Lawrence and Trustee McCoy, when we were here for our orientation, we had an opportunity to go over and see the archives in terms of a lot of the tremendous work that they're doing over there. And I think this is going to be a tremendous opportunity for us to bring the history of this University forward as we go to make sure -- and also, it's just kind of inside of -- if you don't know your history, you know, it's kind of -- it's just not a good thing to do. So I think it's really great that we have faculty members that are willing to take their time to do professional development and also do something that's going to benefit the University.

So with that, members, the Chair is now open for a motion to approve of the sabbatical and professional development leave.

TRUSTEE LAWRENCE: So moved.
TRUSTEE DORTCH: Second.
TRUSTEE CARTER: All those in favor, let it be known by the sign of aye. (AFFIRMATIVE INDICATIONS). TRUSTEE CARTER: All those opposed like sign. (NO RESPONSE).

TRUSTEE CARTER: Thank you so kindly.
PROVOST DAVID: And if $I$ can just as a followup.

TRUSTEE CARTER: Provost David.
PROVOST DAVID: Last year when this was presented, there was a request to know what happens in terms of reporting on the activities. We are in the process of collecting the reports for those who went on sabbatical leave last year, and once those are collected, we will have them posted on our faculty development website.

TRUSTEE CARTER: Members, based upon your agenda, I want to kind of do something a little bit different rather than going directly to the Division of the Academic Affairs update. I'd like to give the Provost, just for a moment, to bring us -- provide us an update on our performance metrics.

And I'd like for you to understand, members, just from a -- as your Chair, I'd prefer for us to always have an update at any and all of our meetings as it regards to this matter, pertaining to our performance metrics. It's very, very important to us, as you all know, and I want us to be able to kind of have an idea as to where we're going, where we are at all times so just in case you find yourself someplace and somebody sticks a microphone in your face, at least you'll be able to intelligently decide whether or not you want to respond.

Provost David, you're recognized.
PROVOST DAVID: Thank you, Chairman Carter.
So I am always happy to talk about the performance funding metrics. As I have said, there are many things about performance funding that you can --

TRUSTEE CARTER: Excuse me, Madam Provost.
There should be a slide in your presentations on that, members.

PROVOST DAVID: There are many things that you can talk about in terms of performance funding, but in terms of benchmarking where we are that is something I'm always interested in, engaged in, and
keeping track of.
As was mentioned, what I have provided as what I thought would be a helpful starting point, particularly for those who might be new to the Board is our performance funding piece from our work plan which was approved last summer, and it's our performance funding goals. Typically these goals are only listed out for five years, but we wanted to be proactive and show where we want to be as a best-in-class land grant institution with a doctoral footprint and a global perspective, and so we put ours out to 2021 to show the trajectory that we believe is the appropriate trajectory for the Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University.

I'll just walk through the ten performance funding metrics as a basic primer, and then I'm happy to answer any questions. Also in the room is Doctor Beverly Barrington who can help me hopefully if I stumble on some of these. I can tell you that the performance funding metrics formulas are complicated. We actually are always trying to understand how we can move the needle forward. And so one of the things we've done is had a conversation about this in the past couple of weeks, and we have scheduled time to go talk with
the Board and the people on the Board who understand the formulas far better than just about anybody else, to make sure that the strategies that I'll tell you about that we are working on already and plan to deploy in the near future will actually help move us forward in the way that we anticipate.

There are eight performance funding metrics that are common to all of the SUS institutions, and then there are two special performance funding metrics, one of which has been chosen by the Board of Governors and one of which is chosen by the Board of Trustees. Taking it from the top on this slide, the first performance funding metric is the percent of bachelor graduates employed or continuing their education in the United States one year after graduation. This is a snapshot, so one year after they graduate, how many of our students are employed and how many -- excuse me, how many of our graduates are employed and how many of our graduates are continuing their education in some kind of a graduate or professional program.

Our numbers are 69\%. Our goals are to increase this over the five years that we have mapped out to 76\%. This is actually a metric where
there was discussion, and a change has now been incorporated which will take into effect next year. The change that was incorporated is to only count as employed those graduates who have an earnings of more than $\$ 25,000$.

This is going to have an impact on all of the universities. It will have a slightly larger impact on our university. I will say that there was a vigorous discussion about this in the Council of Provosts. Most provosts were somewhat concerned about having this change adopted, but we will do what we can to move forward.

One of the interesting things that is presented as a bit of a conundrum is the fact that one of the strategic degrees is education, and in early childhood education, particularly graduates who might be working in daycare settings, salaries in our region are regularly below $\$ 25,000$. So on the one hand, we're encouraging this as a degree and as a critical need for our state; but on the other hand, we're kind of penalizing the institutions for meeting that need because the students are not able to command the salaries that will take them above the 25,000 mark. We'll work through this to the best that we can.

The second benchmark that's here is median wages of bachelor graduates employed full time in Florida one year after graduation. This is another challenge for us. Ours is actually not so bad, 28,800 in terms of benchmarking against the other institutions, but it is a challenge for us because a lot of our students are very highly qualified and sought after outside of the state. And so to the extent that the metric focuses on the salaries of folks who are still in Florida, it doesn't count some of our SBI graduates, for example, who might be recruited to New York or California or Michigan or Chicago at very, very competitive salaries in the 80 to -- you know, $\$ 80,000$ range, that they don't come into our metric.

Another --
CHAIRMAN WARREN: Mr. Chair, this is Trustee Warren. May I ask a question?

TRUSTEE CARTER: You're recognized, sir.
CHAIRMAN WARREN: Thank you.
Provost David, may I offer a suggestion maybe before our -- this presentation is for our edification and not necessarily for submission, if you will, to the Board of Governors.

PROVOST DAVID: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN WARREN: But I think for purposes of our Board of Trustees it's important for all to keep note of the fact of where our folks go, broadly speaking, as opposed to this narrow pleasure here. So if it's possible to insert somewhere in this report as it's presented to us so that we don't get lost on the narrow focus, and I know we're talking now performance funding metrics. PROVOST DAVID: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN WARREN: But there's much to be proud of in terms of where FAMU graduates go nationally and internationally, and you don't get that -- you don't get a gist or a sense of that looking at this report.

PROVOST DAVID: Thank you for that suggestion. When we were helping to prepare the President to respond to the Governor's challenge for employment, we started looking into that information. One of the reasons why this information is collected by the Board is because they have access to some resources that we don't have access -- to which we don't have access. Most notably is they have the ability to track students based on their Social Security numbers through reported databases. We have to rely on what our students report as they
graduate; and as I think Trustee Washington raised in her earlier comments, trying to figure out and get information from students as they're out the door can sometimes be a challenge.

We do have survey information, and what I will try and do is see if we can generate a report that just gives some broad parameters; but I just want to caution you that it's going to be somewhat incomplete. But it does tell a very helpful and important story about the fact that our students have a national reach when they're going out into the world.

So I thank you for that suggestion, and I'm sure I will have something more for you, if not by the March 10th Board meeting, by certainly the next time the Academic Affairs Committee meeting meets.

TRUSTEE DORTCH: This is Trustee Dortch.
Would we not gather that data anyway to have as information on a national basis? It would appear to me it would still work well and bode well as we're looking at corporate America and as we even do recruiting, that in spite of the state only asking for those in Florida, we should -- I would think we would have that anyway, that data, because it also becomes a great tool for us for fund
development if we know the categories of our graduates.

And then the other question is: What percentage are we getting in return from the surveys to be able to accurately say we -- you know, we're giving numbers of our employment in Florida. How accurate is that data?

PROVOST DAVID: So we do have information about where our students are going. We don't necessarily have the wage data, and we don't necessarily have complete data because it's based on students reporting.

We don't collect the data for this particular metric. The Board of Governors collects the data by looking into databases and using tax ID numbers to see who's employed and to do a snapshot of their wages. So we do have information. SBI, for example, regularly touts it. We certainly track it through our career services center, we certainly have information. It's just not going to be the same kind of information that will lead to a number as the kind of number is reported here just because we don't have quite as much ability to garner the specifics as the state does through its reach.

TRUSTEE DORTCH: Okay.
TRUSTEE CARTER: But what we'll do is we'll gather that information, and then we can kind of look and see, give the Provost a little discretion on how she assembles that. And we can also look at that and see how we go forward and use it as mostly planning materials. Instead of putting a note on this chart here which is required by the Board of Governors, at least we can have that data on a separate form, Mr. Chairman, that we can all kind of look at it and then maybe look across some trends or maybe look at some other -- for an example, one of the things that the Provost said about the folks that are working in early childhood, particularly up here in the Panhandle, that data may not necessarily be exciting to the Board of Governors but it's certainly some data that we could look at and maybe look at some good decisions.

So I think that as we go forward this is good to give the feedback and the information to our Provost so she can come up with our -- you know, with your discretion to put it in a form that's readily identifiable and easily digestible to her. PROVOST DAVID: I will do my best.

TRUSTEE CARTER: Okay. All right. Is that okay, members?
(AFFIRMATIVE INDICATIONS).
TRUSTEE CARTER: Thank you. You may proceed. PROVOST DAVID: The next metric is the average cost per bachelor's degree, and to speak on behalf of, I think, all of the provosts, this is the most confusing and the most challenged of the metrics. What the Board of Governors is attempting to do with this is to take the direct and indirect cost of education which includes faculty salaries, advising salaries, and other things that have been identified as being specifically related to the educational experience and then to throw into the pot -- and I'm really understandably going to be vague -- the amount of tuition revenue that's generated, the number of hours and credit hours that's generated; and throwing all of that together, they come up with something called "cost to degree."

Our number is I believe the highest in a State University System next to New College. There are a number of reasons why we think that is the case and we're working on it. One has to do with the number of credit hours that our students take on average
per semester; another is based on the size of our classes and how efficiently and effectively we are deploying our faculty; another is certainly related to the number of excess credit hours that our students are taking, that that actually feeds into the calculations in a variety of different ways for more than one of the metrics. So we're working on trying to make progress on this.

The goal is for this number to be low, and as you see, the media trend is that this is going to go up before we'll be able to get it to go down. That is a combination $I$ think of two factors: One is, as the President has talked about, that large cohort of access and opportunity students that we're still working through our system who have a lot of excess hours that we're trying to help get out and graduate; and then another is, as we are moving forward in trying to reshape our student body, in the past couple of years our student body has gotten a little smaller and so, of course, that factors into this as well.

There has been discussion about trying to come up with a better metric that more reflects the cost to the students, because if you look at out-of-pocket cost to our students, particularly
since we have so many students who are on Pell grants, the out-of-pocket cost to our students is actually reasonably low and very competitive if not the best bargain for our students in the State University System, close to being the best bargain, but that is not the way it is being calculated. There's a working group that is going to be called together that includes financial and academic folks to make presentations about alternative measures of cost to degree that will be, I think, presented to the relevant committee of the Board of Governors. But we're not actually suspecting that they're going to make a change on this metric, at least not in the near future.

FTIC six-year graduation rate, this is the -if you take a cohort of students who started as brand new, first-time-in-college students in the fall, six years later, how many of them have graduated? Our six-year rate that we reported last year is 39\% down from 42\%. We are projecting a dramatic increase in this which is going to require a lot of steps on our part. One is reaching out to students who have stepped away, who are currently in our pipeline and are on our books and making sure that we're doing what we can to help them
graduate.
And then for students who are coming in, what I think the most important thing that we can do and that we're doing is setting the expectation that four years is how long it takes to graduate and making sure that we are putting them into a major, keeping them in a major that will help them be successful and help them get out as quickly as possible. A lot of our students have drifted away, either for financial reasons or because they've been churning in a major where they haven't been successful. And one of the reasons why we are really pleased to have the new regulation in place is that we're going to be much more proactive in advising students onto a path that will help them be successful and reach their ultimate goals.

The academic progress rate that is after the -- again, looking at a snapshot of the students who start as brand new first-time-in-college students in the fall, how many of them return for their sophomore year, and they have to have a GPA of greater than 2.0. So it's a combination of those two factors.

If you look at our retention rate, including students who have less than a 2.0 GPA, it's
actually higher than this, and that's the case for all of the institutions. But for those students with a GPA of greater than 2.0 , our reported for 2015 was 70\%; and we project a dramatic increase in this one as well to 2021. Preliminarily at least our numbers seem to suggest that we have made good progress on this in our first year, so I'm really pleased to give you that hint of the numbers that I can't really finalize until we get them back from the Board of Governors.

TRUSTEE DORTCH: Does the university have a retention program?

PROVOST DAVID: The University has -- so if you mean by rentention program, we have regulations that talk about what a student has to do in order to continue to make academic progress. We also have various initiatives through our student -undergraduate student success center. For example, I think one was mentioned earlier today about them calling students who have stepped out to try and find out information about what's going on and how we can help them continue as a student.

I've gotten a note from the President to remind you that we have, specifically with athletics pursuant to the NCAA grant and as well
with the athletics, a retention program; and we also have our scholarship program that was initiated through generous support of a donor to make sure that we're bringing back on board students who are successful. And that's, you know, part of also what we're working with the alumni to do. The first donor was working towards those high-achieving students, and the alumni effort I think is broader but equally important to our success of reaching students and making sure they have the financial resources to remain on track for graduation.

TRUSTEE DORTCH: Yeah, the reason why I ask is several of the universities in Georgia, even the big white universities, have these programs where they use upperclassmen who are actually engaged and involved in the center types that you've mentioned where they come in and tutor and work with the students to help them through their academic year because we still see a lot of young people coming away from home the first time and they don't get over the shock of being away from home; and then those who come from smaller systems, smaller schools and rural schools, a lot of time that transition is a challenge and so the retention has
been one -- because $I$ know the similar formula here that for every 100 students, for example, in the University System, that's worth about a million dollars in funding over a certain period of time and they calculate that; and therefore, they put forth extra efforts to ensure that they're going to keep those students in school and keep those students up to par. So I was just wondering whether we had a formal retention program to work with students who may be at risk.

TRUSTEE CARTER: Let's hear from -- President Mangum, you wanted to make a comment?

PRESIDENT MANGUM: Yes, thank you.
Trustee Dortch, we also have in-school awards for our high-achieving students, depending upon -and they come at different levels, depending upon their household income. We find that some students after being successful for their first and second year may consider transferring to another institution. So based upon their performance here, we provide scholarship awards to them for their high achievement to get them to come back. And we do it for students that have household -- that are Pell-eligible. But we also have another philanthropist that provides high achieving awards
for students that go up to a household income of $\$ 80,000$. So we are trying advance retention by a variety of approaches in addition to the support and the counseling and mentoring that you mentioned.

TRUSTEE DORTCH: That's great, thank you.
TRUSTEE CARTER: Thank you.
PROVOST DAVID: The next metric that's here, and I should say there are tons and tons of additional metrics, but the next metric that you see here is the University access rate, which is the percent of fall undergraduates with a Pell grant. We are at 62\%. We are the highest percentage in the University System. This for us is -- accounts as an excellent score. I'll come back to the scoring in a moment.

Bachelor's degrees awarded within programs of strategic emphasis, this includes STEM, but it also includes a number of other disciplines that have been identified by the state as being important for the economic growth and well-being of the state. Educational programs are part of it. There are some select programs from other colleges that are part of this metric. There is a way of counting the bachelor's degrees awarded and the graduate
degrees awarded.
As you can see for bachelor's degrees, we are already above $50 \%$ which could be expected for an agricultural and mechanical university with a strong science program and health science program. And we are projecting that we will continue to grow that side of our programming even as we continue, of course, to celebrate the arts and humanities.

For graduate degrees, we are at 43\%, and we are also projecting growth, continued growth in that area.

Finally, we come to the two varying metrics. For the Board of Governors' choice metric, this is percent of bachelor's degrees without excess hours. They chose a metric that would challenge us because we have only $34 \%$ of our students graduating without excess hours, which is to say with no more earned credits or attempted credits than 120 required for graduation plus an additional 10\% leeway.

So we are working very hard to improve that number by reducing the excess credit hours that our students were taking. It will take a while for us to move that needle because, of course, we have to work through the system. All of the students who are already currently here who may have excess
credit hours, but we have aggressive campaigns in place for advising students in a very intrusive and effective way to make progress in that metric.

And then, finally, the Board of Trustees' choice metric, which is the metric that was chosen by the Board for us, this is a metric that was chosen that is a good metric for us, so thank you. And it is the percent of research funding that is external.

We are at 80\%. This is an excellent score for us. It reflects the wonderful productivity of our faculty in securing grants, such as our long-standing NOAA grant, our NFS grants, our National Institute of Health grants and other grants that we have that support research activities and opportunities to do things such as cure cancer and clean waterways.

Let me just briefly say a little bit about the scoring. There are two different ways that you can get a score for each one of the metrics and then what your ultimate score is. It's based on the higher of the two. You can either get an excellent score so they have identified a range of scores that are determined to be the benchmark of excellence for state universities, and there's a
sliding scale within the excellence range for each one of these metrics.

Additionally, if you have made an improvement of your score, you can get points for improvement for each one of these metrics. You actually don't lose points if you slip down. So you can only get improvement points, which is a nice plus; and then what they'll do is they'll take the higher of your excellence or improvement score for each one of these metrics.

It used to be on a 50-point scale with a minimum required score of 26 points. As stated but not quite as applied, if you were in the bottom three institutions in terms of your score, as long as you -- let me stop for a second. If you did not meet the minimum, then you're required to have a work plan and have the oversight of the Board. I want to make sure that I state unequivocally that FAMU has never not made the minimum. We have always made the minimum score.

If you are in the bottom three, then as stated, you're not supposed to be eligible for performance funding. Last year, they actually took some of our money from prior award of performance funding and put it back into the pool for
performance funding which resulted in a $\$ 2.7$ million cut to our budget. That was a different interpretation than had been announced at the beginning of the year.

If you are above the bottom three, and last year was also complicated by the fact that there were some ties so they kind of also redefined what it meant to be in the bottom three. But if you were above the bottom three, then you're then in the pool for performance funding for the next cycle.

It's now been changed to a hundred-point scale and you're required to have a minimum score of 52. As I said, our preliminary numbers are in. I can't talk about them because they're not final, but we are seeing some improvement scores that we're pleased about. But one of the things that it's worth mentioning is that this system is volatile, so you've seen that the schools bounce around a lot. Because one year if you might have a lot of improvement, your score might be very high because you have improvement, but then the next year it's kind of hard to maintain that level of improvement. And if you haven't made it into the excellence band, you might get no score or a much lower score
for that particular metric.
So we're seeing a lot of volatility and, of course, it's not just whether or not you have a good score, it's where you are in the order of things; and so we don't know where we will be in the order of things, which means that we will just keep working as hard as we can until March when all of this information is made available.

So that's a kind of primer on how the performance funding metrics work with some of our goals. They're actually -- I'm getting this big note from Doctor Barrington who is trying to say that the -- oh, yes, who is reminding me to remind you that since we are waiting for our report to be finalized, our information to be finalized, that will be put into our accountability report. The timing of it at this particular junction is that we won't get the accountability report back from the Board of Governors until the beginning of March. It has to be approved by the Board of Trustees, so the Academic Affairs Committee will have to have a special committee meeting in order to approve that and consider it so that it can then be presented to the Board of Trustees so that the Board of Trustees can consider it and hopefully approve it in time
for it to be then submitted to the Board of Governors. But the timing of our meetings just didn't quite synch for that to happen seamlessly.

TRUSTEE CARTER: Thank you.
Members, are there any questions?
TRUSTEE LAWSON: Yes. Yes, I do. This is Lawson.

Chair Carter, I have a question actually pertaining to you. My understanding is that there were one if not two universities that were able to have -- I won't say exception, but slightly different metrics based on kind of their current state. Can you share with us how that was possible from your days on the Board of Governors?

TRUSTEE CARTER: It was primarily New College because of their missions and their focus. They're a smaller school in the system, about 800 students or so; and they are primarily just a -- I don't want to discount them just because they don't have the STEM program or anything like that; but they're primarily a baccalaureate institution and they're pretty much -- and their cohort of universities are different than the other universities and all, so they have a separate one exactly for New College and all that.

TRUSTEE LAWSON: Okay. And was it only New College that had the exceptions, the two exceptions?

TRUSTEE CARTER: Yeah, it was FSU and the University of Florida because of their preeminence.

TRUSTEE LAWSON: Preeminent status that they were pursuing?

TRUSTEE CARTER: Yes.
TRUSTEE LAWSON: Yeah. So then my second question is for Provost David. I still don't understand, what are we doing -- what's our plan to work with either the Committee or the chancellor or the appropriate body at the Board of Governors to try and more strategically influence the mechanics behind the metrics? The metrics I'm sure are going to stay in place. That, you know, makes perfect sense. But how the metrics are calculated, some, you know, additional background that -particularly this one about employment because we know for, you know, two of our marquis programs, pharmacy and business, a lot of our kids follow the opportunities out of state or back home and we don't get credit for those so, you know, right there, at least for me, that's a negative for us just in how the metric is determined.

But I'm still yet to understand, what's our plan or our approach to engaging the Board of Governors on the mechanics behind these metrics such that they are, in some cases, more realistic than what our reality is.

TRUSTEE CARTER: Before she answers, I think it's going to be critical that we have some data prior to doing that when we go to the Board of Governors.

TRUSTEE LAWSON: Sure. Oh, absolutely. I would agree, Chair Carter, but I still would like to understand, you know, how do we plan to engage there? Because I think to your point, Chair Carter, if we had empirical data that spoke to where our graduates went, I know that's hard to get. I know Doctor Friday Stroud probably could do some justice to helping us from a School of Business standpoint; but, you know, to have that metric sit out there knowing that we send kids away to very promising opportunities but we send a lot of them out of state from those two programs. TRUSTEE CARTER: That's true. Provost. PROVOST DAVID: So we engage all the time -the Council of Provosts, for example, has given lots of input as to these various metrics. As I
mentioned, there has been in the past on at least two different occasions and there's plans to be another conversation with experts in the room talking about the cost to degree and other things that are out there. The short answer isn't that we're not engaging. A short answer is that there are policies that are driving some of these metrics, particularly the ones that are Florida-centric and that we don't make very much headway.

So they know, we talk to them about it. They know where our students are going. We really do present this information. I'm happy to, you know, have the Board of Trustees and other people have the conversation as well, but as an example, the Governor's recent initiative on a 100\% employment is focused on employing people 100\% in Florida.

All of the statistics that he quoted were statistics that said, you know -- the statistic that said you have only $60 \%$ of your graduates employed, that's because they're only counting the graduates who are employed in the State of Florida. The focus is on the Florida aspect.

And so there are bigger policy issues that are at stake that we don't have very much sway over,
but we really are making the effort. We are constantly in conversations trying to influence the performance funding metrics, I promise. It's just that the policies that are in place are policies that are pretty much enshrined in the performance funding metrics as they currently exist.

TRUSTEE CARTER: And just so you know, Trustee Lawson, is that this is not just a concern by FAMU, a lot of the universities have come back to us over and over again, particularly as it relates to the performance metrics because, for an example, you consider some of the employees that are outside of the state. There are a number of states that are in a consortium where we can gain information, but there are several like our neighbors to the north, Georgia is not a member of that; so let's say we get folks that get a job in Atlanta, there's no way for us to capture that data. So a lot of that is -- and it's still a process of discussions among the provosts and the presidents as they deal with the Board of Governors on this. And we're still trying to kind of come up with a -- I don't want to say a one size fits all, but a better methodology in terms of how we're doing that. So it's still a process that's in -- it's kind of like planning and
activation at the same time, for lack of a better description.

TRUSTEE LAWSON: Okay. Thank you.
TRUSTEE CARTER: Okay. Any further questions on our performance metrics?
(NO RESPONSE) •
TRUSTEE CARTER: Just so you know, members, we have some new members of the Board of Trustees, so I wanted just for the sake of clarity and information purposes for the provost to go through this for us because this is kind of important. I say kind of, that's being tongue in cheek; but this is the way for us to move forward. And as you can see, we are making progress. None of this is final yet. Obviously we'll have to present it to the Board of Governors before -- after we get it there, but for now I wanted to make sure that we were all on the same page and we could see how important these performance metrics are and to see how we're doing on them. So every time we have a meeting, unless it's at a special called meeting that our Provost mentioned, I certainly want us to have an opportunity to discuss our performance metrics.

PROVOST DAVID: Well, and thankfully that special called meeting will be specifically about
the accountability report, which includes the performance funding metrics, so I'll be able to comply even at least for that special called meeting.

CHAIRMAN WARREN: Mr. Chair, this is Trustee Warren.

TRUSTEE CARTER: You're recognized.
CHAIRMAN WARREN: Yeah, I think this was a wonderful discussion on the part of the Provost about the performance metrics. And Trustee Lawson's line of questioning, I think it's informative for all of us in that the performance funding metrics don't capture in any -- they don't capture the university that we are, particularly as it relates to the product that we produce. You know, historically Florida A \& M has been referred to as the Harvard of the south or maybe Harvard as the A \& M of the north. But our graduates go all over the place, and it's unfortunate that they don't get captured into the numbers in terms of how we're doing as a university.

But more importantly, I think it's important for us to recognize that you can't base the performance of the University solely on the performance metrics numbers. It is how we are
impacted financially for sure and the lobbying effort that we would continue in the Council of Provosts with the Board of Governors about the underlying formula methods used to compute these metrics, we have to continue to work at that. But for you or us as members of the Board of Trustees, it's important to know the fallacies, if you will, in the arithmetic and how that adversely impacts the University given the product that we produce. TRUSTEE CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Trustees, are there any more comments before we move to our next item?
(NO RESPONSE).
TRUSTEE CARTER: If not, Provost David, you're recognized to bring us to speed on the Academic Affairs.

PROVOST DAVID: Thank you, I'll be brief.
I wanted to actually relate just a little back to the performance funding goals in that last fall we tried a number of different initiatives that will help us move forward. Specifically, we have a new math lab which is helping our students. One of our barrier courses is mathematics for students, so we have a new math lab that we have put in place in the Dyson Building, and that is allowing us to do
supplemental instruction and math laboratories where students can do problem sets on a computer which gives them feedback; and at the same time, there's also upper-class students who are available to answer questions and help them with their understanding of the math concepts.

We've also used a much more vigorous deployment of ALEKS, which is a math placement exam, to try and make sure we were getting students into the right math classes to begin with. And we've seen some success with that in some of our classes, that we had students who were able to get through there placed in the right class and they're able to get through the math classes.

At the same time our dean of science and technology has been working very closely with the substantive colleges, such as allied health and pharmacy and business about tailoring some of the math and science courses so that it's being really specific, so the math will be very specific to business -- pre-business students, the math -science will be very specific to pre-pharmacy students. And we're beginning to see some progress on that front as well.

Our Living-Learning Communities invited
students into themed areas, including health sciences, business and science and engineering. And we're trying to be very careful because we want to run the data to see what the impact is so that we can be deliberate in deploying our strategies, but preliminarily, it looks as if the Living-Learning Communities have had a beneficial impact on the fall success of the first group of students.

A couple of things that we have in the works moving forward that we hope to deploy this spring for next year, one is putting in place courses in common so that we have groups of students who are taking courses together. This is something that's been very successful with other universities on a national level. It provides a different kind of learning community. It's not a living-learning community, but it's a learning community nonetheless so that students know who to go study with and how -- who to go have help with and they can provide support to each other.

And then we're also continuing with our effort to put in place mandatory scheduling and preregistration. We did a first run of preregistration last fall, and we're going to
continue that this spring, and then for incoming freshmen, we are going to have mandatory schedules. We're going to give them their schedule as opposed to saying: This is the list of courses you should be taking and then letting them schedule themselves. So these are all things that we believe will get students on track and keep them on track.

And then just as a side note, I'd just like to inform the Academic Affairs Committee that recently Dean Epps of the law school, Felicia Epps was appointed the inaugural Shirley Cunningham Chair.

TRUSTEE CARTER: Thank you, Provost.
Members, are there any questions? (NO RESPONSE).

TRUSTEE CARTER: Let me just say, Vice Chairman Lawson, thank you for the opportunity for us to go out of order. And of course, I'm looking at the clock, and I don't want to stand between anybody during lunch. Are there any other questions for our committee?
(NO RESPONSE).
TRUSTEE CARTER: Hearing none, we are adjourned.

CHAIRMAN WARREN: Thank you. Chair Lawson,

I'm back in the fold.
TRUSTEE LAWSON: All right.
CHAIRMAN WARREN: Thank you for standing in my stead. The meetings have been quite informative.

We are at the lunch break, and I'm going to recommend that we do indeed take it rather than moving one of the committees up. All of you like me are probably due for some kind of break at the moment, so we'll reconvene at 1 o'clock.

And I'm assuming at that time we would take on the special -- the President's Evaluation Committee? Which one did we skip over?

TRUSTEE CARTER: That was it.
TRUSTEE LAWSON: We skipped over the Evaluation Committee, and we took the Academic Affairs Committee. So we still have Audit and Compliance and Facilities yet to do as well.

CHAIRMAN WARREN: Okay. Maybe by -- when we reconvene at 1 o'clock, maybe by then Trustee Moore will be available and we can go on with that committee as a first start.

Thank you all for participating. I look forward to having you back for the committees when we reconvene at 1 o'clock.

TRUSTEE LAWSON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WARREN: I suggest also that you follow Ms. Royster's advice and try to call in a little earlier just in case there are some connection issues that need to be resolved that can happen before the 1 o'clock time frame. TRUSTEE LAWRENCE: Is there a problem if we simply stay on the phone?
(WHEREUPON, THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED).
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



| $\begin{aligned} & \text { lower }[1]-32: 25 \\ & \text { lunch }[3]-3: 10, \\ & 44: 20,45: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { members [17] - } 3: 3, \\ 3: 17,5: 10,7: 20,8: 19 \\ 10: 1,10: 19,10: 23, \end{gathered}$ | 24:3 mostly [1] - 20:6 motion [5] - 5:15, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 43:19 } \\ & \text { north }[2]-38: 15, \\ & 40: 18 \end{aligned}$ | ```outside [2] - 16:8, 38:12 oversight [1] - 31:17``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M | $21: 2,34: 5,39: 7,39: 8,$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { move [10] - } 3: \\ 4: 13,13: 22,1 \end{array}$ | $\text { note }[5]-17: 3,20: 7 \text {, }$ |  |
| ```Madam [2]-8:14, 12:19 maintain [1] - 32:23 major [3]-24:7, 24:11 mandatory [2] - 43:23, 44:2 Mangum [2]-3:13, 27:12 MANGUM [1] - 27:13 mapped [1] - 14:25 March [3] - 18:15, 33:7, 33:19 Marissa [1] - 9:15 mark [1] - 15:24 marquis [1] - 35:20 materials [2]-7:12, 20:7 math [10] - 41:22, 41:24, 42:1, 42:6, 42:8, 42:10, 42:14, 42:19, 42:20, 42:21 mathematics [1] - 41:23 matter [1] - 12:4 MATTHEW[1]-1:7 McCoy [1] - 10:9 mean [1]-25:14 means [1]-33:6 meant [1] - 32:8 meantime [1]-4:20 measures [1]-23:9 mechanical [1] - 29:4 Mechanical [1] - 13:14 mechanics [2] - 35:14, 36:3 media [1]-22:10 median [1] - 16:1 meet [1] - 31:16 MEETING [2] - 1:4, 46:9 meeting[12] - 3:12, 4:2, 5:11, 5:21, 15:22, 18:15, 18:16, 33:22, 39:20, 39:21, 39:25, 40:4 meetings [4] - 3:7, 12:4, 34:2, 45:4 meets [1] - 18:16 Mehboob [1] - 9:17 member [2] - 6:10, 38:16``` | ```MEMBERS [1] - 1:7 mentioned [6] - 13:2, 25:19, 26:17, 28:5, 37:1, 39:22 mentioning [1] - 32:18 mentoring [1] - 28:4 methodology [1] - 38:23 methods [1] - 41:4 metric [21]-14:14, 14:25, 16:9, 16:15, 19:14, 21:5, 22:23, 23:13, 28:8, 28:10, 28:24, 29:13, 29:15, 30:3, 30:5, 30:6, 30:7, 33:1, 35:25, 36:19 metrics [35]-11:25, 12:5, 12:16, 13:16, 13:20, 14:8, 14:11, 17:8, 21:8, 22:7, 28:10, 29:12, 30:20, 31:2, 31:5, 31:10, 33:10, 34:12, 35:15, 35:17, 36:3, 36:25, 37:8, 38:3, 38:6, 38:11, 39:5, 39:19, 39:23, 40:2, 40:10, 40:13, 40:25, 41:5 METZKE [3] - 1:16, 47:5, 47:11 Michigan [1] - 16:12 microphone [1] - 12:10 middle [1] - 7:4 might [6]-13:4, 15:17, 16:11, 32:20, 32:21, 32:25 million [2] - 27:3, 32:2 minimum [5] - 31:12, 31:16, 31:19, 31:20, 32:13 minutes[3]-5:10, 5:12, 5:20 missions [1] - 34:16 moment [3]-11:23, 28:16, 45:9 money [1]-31:24 Moore [3] - 3:4, 4:16, 45:19 morning [1] - 6:5 most [5]-15:10, 17:22, 21:7, 21:8,``` | ```15:12, 29:23, 39:13, 41:12, 41:21 moved [5]-5:16, 5:19, 8:4, 8:5, 11:1 moving [4]-8:23, 22:18, 43:11, 45:7 N NANCY \({ }_{[3]}\) - 1:16, 47:5, 47:11 nancy@metzke. com [1] - 1:22 narrow [2] - 17:4, 17:7 National [1] - 30:14 national [3]-18:11, 18:19, 43:16 nationally \({ }_{[1]}\) - 17:11 NCAA [1] - 25:25 near [2]-14:5, 23:14 necessarily [4] - 16:23, 19:10, 19:11, 20:16 need [4]-8:2, 15:20, 15:22, 46:4 needle [2] - 13:22, 29:23 negative [1] - 35:24 neighbors [1] - 38:15 never [1] - 31:19 New [5] - 16:12, 21:22, 34:15, 34:24, 35:1 new [8] - 7:3, 13:4, 23:17, 24:13, 24:19, 39:8, 41:22, 41:24 newly [1] - 7:9 next [10] - 15:2, 18:15, 21:5, 21:22, 28:8, 28:10, 32:10, 32:22, 41:12, 43:12 NFS \({ }_{[1]}-30: 13\) nice [1] - 31:7 nicole [1] - 2:2 NO \({ }_{[11]}-5: 3,5: 13\), 5:25, 7:21, 8:12, 10:3, 11:7, 39:6, 41:13, 44:15, 44:22 NOAA [1] - 30:13 none [3]-5:14, 39:14, 44:23 nonetheless [1] -``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { notes }[1]-47: 6 \\ & \text { noticed }[1]-10: 8 \\ & \text { number }[12]-19: 22, \\ & 21: 17,21: 21,21: 23, \\ & 21: 24,22: 4,22: 9, \\ & 28: 19,29: 21,38: 13, \\ & 41: 20 \\ & \text { numbers }[9]-14: 23, \\ & 17: 24,19: 6,19: 15, \\ & 25: 6,25: 8,32: 14, \\ & 40: 20,40: 25 \end{aligned}$O <br> o'clock $[6]-3: 6$, <br> $3: 13,45: 9,45: 19$, <br> $45: 24,46: 5$ <br> obviously $[1]-39: 15$ <br> occasions $[1]-37: 2$ <br> OF $[3]-1: 1,47: 3$, <br> 47:3 <br> offer $[1]-16: 21$ <br> OFFICE $[1]-1: 20$ <br> once $[1]-11: 16$ <br> one $[39]-3: 9,3: 13$, <br> $3: 15,6: 19,6: 23,8: 2$, <br> $13: 23,14: 11,14: 12$, <br> $14: 16,14: 17,15: 13$, <br> $15: 15,15: 19,16: 3$, <br> $17: 18,20: 13,21: 24$, <br> $22: 7,22: 12,23: 22$, <br> $24: 12,25: 5,25: 19$, <br> $27: 1,30: 20,31: 2$, <br> $31: 5,31: 9,32: 17$, <br> $32: 20,34: 10,34: 24$, <br> $35: 19,38: 23,41: 22$, <br> $43: 12,45: 7,45: 12$ <br> ones $[1]-37: 8$ <br> open $[2]-8: 1,10: 23$ <br> opportunities $[3]-$ <br> $30: 16,35: 22,36: 20$ <br> opportunity $[9]-$ <br> $3: 10,5: 9,7: 24,8: 20$, <br> $10: 10,10: 14,22: 14$, <br> $39: 23,44: 17$ <br> opposed $[5]-5: 24$, <br> 8:11, 11:6, 17:4, 44:3 <br> order $[7]-3: 23,4: 19$, <br> $25: 15,33: 4,33: 6$, <br> $33: 22,44: 18$ <br> orientation $[1]-$ <br> $10: 10$ <br> out-of-pocket $[2]-$ <br> 22:25, 23:2 <br>  | ```P.M \({ }_{[1]}-1: 11\) p.m [2] - 3:8, 3:15 page [1]-39:18 Panhandle [1] - 20:15 par [1]-27:8 parameters [1] - 18:7 part [5]-23:22, 26:6, 28:22, 28:24, 40:9 participating [1] - 45:22 particular [3] - 19:13, 33:1, 33:17 particularly [8] - 13:4, 15:16, 20:15, 22:25, 35:19, 37:8, 38:10, 40:14 passed [1] - 8:13 past [3]-13:24, 22:19, 37:1 path [1]-24:15 Peggy [1] - 7:1 Pell [3]-23:1, 27:24, 28:12 Pell-eligible [1] - 27:24 penalizing \({ }_{[1]}\) - 15:21 people [4]-14:1, 26:20, 37:14, 37:17 per [2] - 21:6, 22:1 percent \([4]\) - 14:15, 28:12, 29:14, 30:8 percentage [2] - 19:4, 28:14 perfect [1]-35:16 performance [31] - 11:24, 12:5, 12:16, 12:17, 12:23, 13:5, 13:7, 13:15, 13:20, 14:8, 14:10, 14:14, 17:8, 27:20, 31:23, 31:24, 32:1, 32:10, 33:10, 38:3, 38:5, 38:11, 39:5, 39:19, 39:23, 40:2, 40:10, 40:12, 40:24, 40:25, 41:19 period [1] - 27:4 Perry [1]-9:12 person [1]-7:17 personal \({ }_{[1]}-10: 5\) perspective [1] - 13:11``` |



| $\text { 17:21, } 26: 11$ | 32:19 | show [2]-13:9, | $\text { stand }_{[1]}-44: 19$ | $22: 24,22: 25,23: 1,$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8:23 | $\mathbf{s}$ | :12 |  | 23:2, 23:4, 23:16, 23:17, 23:23, 24:2, |
| respond [2] - 12:12, |  | 44 | standpoint [2] - | 4:9, 24:15, 24:1 |
| 17:17 | sciences [6]-9:10, | 5:22, 8: | 10:5, 36:1 | 4:25, 25 |
| RESPONSE) ${ }^{[11]}$ | 9:13, 9:16, 9:18, 9:21 | 11:4, 11:6 <br> similar [1] - 27:1 | [2]-24:19 | 25:20, 26:5, 26:8 |
| 5:3, 5:13, 5:25, | $\begin{aligned} & 43: 2 \\ & \text { Sciences }[1]-7: 6 \\ & \text { score }[15]-28: 15, \\ & 30: 10,30: 20,30: 21, \\ & 30: 23,31: 4,31: 9 \end{aligned}$ |  | 45:21started $[4]-7: 4$, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 26:10, 26:19, 27:2, } \\ & \text { 27:7, 27:8, 27:10, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 8:12, 10:3, 11:7, 39:6, |  | $\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{simply}_{[1]}-46: 7 \\ & \text { sit }_{[1]}-36: 19 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 41:13, 44:15, 44:22 |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { started }[4]-7: 4 \\ 7: 10,17: 18,23: 16 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 27:7, 27:8, 27:10, } \\ & \text { 27:15, 27:17, 27:23, } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | sit [1] - 36:19 <br> situation [1]-3:9 | starting [1] - 13:3 | $\begin{aligned} & 28: 1,29: 16,29: 22, \\ & 29: 24,30: 2,34: 17, \end{aligned}$ |
| ention [6]-24:24 |  | six [3] - 23:15, 23:18, | STATE [1] - 47:3 <br> state [12] - 15:20, |  |
| 25:12, 26:1, 26:25, | 31:12, 31:14, 31:20, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23:19 } \\ & \text { six-year [2] - 23:15, } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 29:24, 30:2, 34:17, } \\ & \text { 37:12, 41:22, 41:23, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 27:9, 2 | 32:13, 32:21, 32:25 |  | 16:8, 18:22, 19:24, |  |
| return [2]-19:4 | 33: | $23: 19$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:8, 18:22, 19:24, } \\ & 28: 20,28: 21,30: 25, \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 24:2 | scores [2] - 30:23, |  | $31: 18,34: 13,35: 22,$36:21, 38:11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 42:12, 42:21, 42:23, } \\ & \text { 43:1, 43:9, 43:13, } \end{aligned}$ |
| enue [1] - 21: | 32: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { size }_{[2]}-22: 1,38: 23 \\ & \text { skip }_{[1]}-45: 12 \\ & \text { skipped }[1]-45: 14 \end{aligned}$slide [2] - 12:20, |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 43:19, } 44: 7 \\ & \text { study }[1]-43: 19 \\ & \text { stumble }[1]-13: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| review [1] - 7:24 | 28:16 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 36: 21,38: 13 \\ & \text { State }[3]-21: 21, \end{aligned}$ |  |
| reviewed [2] - 7: | 30: |  | $23: 4,37: 22$ <br> states [2] - 6:9 |  |
| 7:14 | mlessly [1] - $34: 3$ | 14:14 |  | stumble [1] - 13:19 submission [1] - |
| risk [1] - 27:10 | ond [9] | sliding [1] - 31:1 | 38:1 | 16:23 |
| robert [1]-2:3 | 5:181 | [2] - 15:7 | States [1] - 14:16 <br> statistic [1] - 37:19 | submitted ${ }_{[1]}$ - 34:1 <br> substantive [1] - |
| bertson [1]-7:6 | 18, | 34:11 |  |  |
| 4:22, 4:2 | 35: |  | statistics [2]-37:18, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 42:17 } \\ & \text { success }[4]-25: 18, \end{aligned}$ |
| om [2]-13: | seconded [1] - 5:20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { slip }[1]-31: 6 \\ & \text { smaller }[4]-22: 20, \\ & 26: 23,34: 17 \end{aligned}$ | 37:19 <br> status [1]-35:6 |  |
| 37 | securing [1]-30:12 |  |  | $26: 10,42: 11,43: 8$ |
| OOM [1] - 1:13 | urity ${ }_{[1]}[17$-17:24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 26:23, } 34: 17 \\ & \text { snapshot }[3]-14: 17, \end{aligned}$ | status [1] - 35:6 <br> stay [2] - 35:16, 46:7 | $\begin{gathered} \text { successful [6] - } \\ 24: 8,24: 12,24: 16, \end{gathered}$ |
| Royster's [1] - 46 | -3:17, 10:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 19:16, } 24: 18 \\ & \text { social [2] - 9:10, } 9: 21 \end{aligned}$ | stead [1] - 45:4 |  |
| RPR [3] - 1:16, 47:5 | 10:11, 18:6, 19:16, |  | STEM [2]-28:18, | $\begin{aligned} & 24: 8,24: 12,24: 16, \\ & 26: 5,27: 18,43: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| 47:11 | 20:4, 20:6, 2 | Social [2] - 7:5, | 34:20 | suggest [2] - 25:6, |
| run [2]-43:4, 43: | 26:20, 28:11, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:23 } \\ & \text { solely }[1]-40: 24^{\text {someplace }[1]-12: 9} \end{aligned}$ | stenographic [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 46:1 } \\ & \text { suggesting }{ }_{[1]}-3: 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| rural [1] - 26:24 | 39:18, 39:19, |  | 47:6 |  |
| S | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 42:23, 43:4 } \\ & \text { seeing }[2]-32: 16, \\ & 33: 2 \end{aligned}$ |  | -47:5 | $\begin{gathered} \text { suggestion }[3]- \\ 16: 21,17: 15,18: 13 \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  | sometimes [1] - 18:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { stepped }[2]-23: 23, \\ & 25: 20 \end{aligned}$ | summer [1] - 13:6 |
| Sab | 33:2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { somewhat }[2] \text { - } \\ & 15: 10,18: 8 \end{aligned}$ |  | supplemental [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 8: 17,8: 24, \\ & 10: 24,11: 1 \end{aligned}$ | select [1] - 28:23 semester $[1]-22: 1$ | somewhere [1] |  | 42:1 <br> support [5] - 8:22, |
| sabbaticals [2]-9:2 | $\text { send }[3]-6: 20 \text {, }$ | 17:6 | sticks [1] - 12:9 | $26: 3,28: 3,30: 15,$ |
| e [1] - 39:9 | 36:19, 36:2 |  | 18:20, 22:15, 26:20, 35:10, 36:1, 36:11, | 43:21 |
| salaries [6]-15: | :13 |  |  | supposed [1] - 31:22 |
| 15:23, 16:9, 16:13, |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 35: 10,36: 1,36: 11, \\ & 38: 19,38: 21,38: 24, \end{aligned}$ | survey [1]-18:5 |
| 21:11, 21:12 | parate [2]-20:10 | sounds [1] - 5:8 | $\begin{aligned} & 38: 19,38: 21,38: 24, \\ & 45: 16 \end{aligned}$ | surveys [1] - 19: |
| Sarah [1] - 7: |  | south [1] - 40:17 <br> speaking ${ }_{[1]}$ - 17:4 | stop [1] - 31:15 | SUS [1] - 14:9 |
| SBI [2] - 16:11, 19:17 | vices [1]-19:1 | pecial ${ }_{[1]}-4: 14$ | story [1] - 18:10 |  |
| scale [3] - 31:1, |  |  | rategic [2] - 15:1 | 23:12 |
| 31:11, 32:12 | [1] - 24 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 28:18 } \\ & \text { strategically }{ }_{[1]} \text { - } \\ & 35: 14 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| schedule [2]-44:3, | [1]-15:1 | $33: 22,39: 21,39: 25,$ $40: 3,45: 11$ |  | 3:14 |
| 44:5 | several [2]-26:14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { specific }[3]-42: 20, \\ & 42: 22 \end{aligned}$ |  | suspending [1] - |
| scheduled [2]-3:6 | 38:15 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 35: 14 \\ & \text { strategies }[2]-14: 4, \end{aligned}$ | 3:12 |
| 13:25 | shall [1] -6:14 | $\begin{gathered} \text { specifically [4] - } \\ 21: 13,25: 24,39: 25, \end{gathered}$ | 43:5 | sway [1] - 37:25 <br> synch [1]-34:3 |
| ed | SHANNON [5] - 1 |  |  |  |
| scheduling | 4:6, 5:7, 5:16, $8: 7$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 41:21 } \\ & \text { specifics }[1]-19: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Stroud }[1]-36: 16 \\ & \text { student }[6]-22: 18 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { System [4]-21:22, } \\ & 23: 5,27: 3,28: 14 \end{aligned}$ |
| 43:23 | hannon [4]-4:1 |  |  |  |
| olarly [1] - 8:20 | 4:6, 4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { specifics }[1]-19: 24 \\ & \text { speed }_{[1]}-41: 15 \end{aligned}$ | 22:19, 25:15, 25:17, | $\begin{gathered} \text { system }[4]-22: 15, \\ 29: 24,32: 18,34: 17 \\ \text { systems }[1]-26: 23 \end{gathered}$ |
| scholarship [3] - 9:5, | share [1]-3 | spite [1]-18:22 <br> spring [2] - 43:11 | $25: 18,25: 22$ |  |
| 26: | - |  |  |  |
| ool [1] - 36:17 | [1] - 44:1 | 44:1 <br> staff [2]-8:19, 8:22 <br> stake [1] - 37:25 | 14:18, 15:23, 16:7, 17:23, 17:25, 18:3, 18:10, 19:9, 19:12, 21:25, 22:5, 22:14, |  |
| school [4]-27:7, | Shock [1]-26:22 |  |  |  |
| 27:14, 34:17, 44:11 schools [3]-26:24, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { short }[3]-7: 11,37: 5 \text {, } \\ & 37: 6 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | tailoring [1] - 42:18 |


| TALLAHASSEE [2] - 1:14, 1:21 | trends [1]-20:12 <br> tried $[1]$ - 41:20 |  | Vice ${ }_{[1]}$ - 44:16 vigorous [2] - 15:9, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:24, 22:19, 23:18, } \\ & \text { 24:5 } \\ & \text { York }[1]-16: 12 \\ & \text { young }[1]-26: 20 \\ & \text { yourself }[1]-12: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | tried [1] - 41:20 true ${ }_{[2]}$ - 36:22, 47:6 TRUSTEE [81] - 3:3, 3:16, 3:19, 3:22, 3:24, 4:4, 4:5, 4:6, 4:7, 4:8, 4:9, 4:17, 5:1, 5:2, 5:4, 5:5, 5:6, 5:7, 5:8, |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 5:4, 5:5, 5:6, 5:7, 5:8, <br> $5: 14,5: 16,5: 17,5: 18$, | under [1] - 6:17 undergraduate ${ }_{[1]}$ | W |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 9: 15,42: 16 \\ & \text { ten }[1]-13: 15 \\ & \text { tenure }[4]-6: 3,6: 5, \end{aligned}$6:10, 6:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 5:14, 5:16, 5:17, 5:18, } \\ & \text { 5:19, 5:24, 6:1, 7:19, } \\ & 7: 22,8: 4,8: 5,8: 7, \\ & \text { 8:8, 8:11, 8:13, 10:1, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 25:18 } \\ & \text { undergraduates }[1]- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { wage }[1]-19: 10 \\ & \text { wages }[2]-16: 2, \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  | 28:12 <br> underlying [1] - 41:4 understandably ${ }_{[1]}$ | 19:17 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 6: 10,6: 16 \\ & \text { Tenure }[1]-6: 21 \\ & \text { terms }[9]-10: 11, \\ & 11: 14,12: 23,12: 24, \\ & 16: 5,17: 11,31: 14, \\ & 38: 24,40: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 8:8, 8:11, 8:13, 10:1, } \\ & \text { 10:4, 11:1, 11:2, 11:3, } \\ & \text { 11:6, 11:8, 11:11, } \end{aligned}$ |  | waiting [1] - 33:14 |  |
|  |  |  | walk [1] - 13:15 |  |
|  | 11:6, 11:8, 11:11, <br> 11:19, 12:19, 16:19, | 21:15 | Warren [3]-2:4, |  |
|  | 18:17, 20:1, 20:2, | unequivocally ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 16:18, 40:6 |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21:1, 21:4, 25:11, } \\ & \text { 26:13, 27:11, 28:6, } \end{aligned}$ | 31:18 | WARREN $[10]$ - |  |
| 38:24, 40:20 thankfully $[1]$ - 39:24 |  | unfortunate [1] - | 16:17, 16:20, 17:1, |  |
| THE [1] - 46:8 themed [1]-43:1 themselves [1]- | 28:7, 34:4, 34:6, <br> 34:15, 35:1, 35:4, <br> 35:6, 35:8, 35:9, 36:6, | 40:19 | 17:10, 40:5, 40:8, |  |
|  |  | unit $[1]-6: 15$ | $44: 25,45: 3,45: 18$, $46: 1$ |  |
|  | $35: 6,35: 8,35: 9,36: 6$, | United [1] -14:16 | 46:1 ${ }_{\text {WAS }}^{\text {[1] - }}$-46:9 |  |
| 44:6therefore $[1]-27: 5$they've $[1]-24: 10$ | 36:10, 36:22, 38:7, <br> 39:3, 39:4, 39:7, 40:7, | universities [9] - 15:7, $26: 14, ~ 26: 15, ~$ | Washington [2] - |  |
|  | 41:10, 41:14, 44:13, 44:16, 44:23, 45:2 | 30:25, 34:10, 34:22, | 2:2, 18:1 |  |
| THOMAS ${ }_{[1]}-1: 8$ three [5]-31:14, |  | 34:23, 38:9, 43:15 | waterways [1] - |  |
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