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CHAIR CRIDER: I'd like to call the meeting to order.

Ms. Franklin, if you can call the roll.

MS. FRANKLIN: Mr. Askew.

MR. ASKEW: Present.

MS. FRANKLIN: Mr. Bell.

VICE CHAIR BELL: Present.

MS. FRANKLIN: Ms. Bennett.

MS. BENNETT: Yes.

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

CHAIR CRIDER: Here.

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

MR. DYKE: Here.

MS. FRANKLIN: Mr. Felton. Dr. Lemus.

MS. LEMUS: Here.

MS. FRANKLIN: Dr. Lyons.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Here.

MS. FRANKLIN: General Schwartz.
MR. SCHWARTZ: Here.

MS. FRANKLIN: Mr. Shelton.

MR. SHELTON: Here.

MS. FRANKLIN: Dr. Tardd.

MR. TARDD: Here.

MS. FRANKLIN: Mr. Thompson.

MR. THOMPSON: Here.

MS. FRANKLIN: Mr. Wyner.

MR. WYNER: Here.

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

CHAIR CRIDER: Thank you, Ms. Franklin. I'd like to have a motion for approval of the minutes.

I'd like to entertain a motion for approval of the minutes of the January 27, 2015 meeting.

(Moved and seconded.)

It's been moved and seconded. All in favor of approval vote aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Any nays or abstentions?
Motion carries.

Ms. Franklin, I'd like to entertain a motion to make a change to the agenda. The first change I'd like to make is to move up the Report of the President to follow the approval of the minutes. And then I'd like to add to the agenda resolutions for four executive appointments.

MS. POINER: Motion is so moved, Madam Chair.

MS. CASTILLO: Seconded.

CHAIR CRIDER: It's been moved and seconded. Any discussion? All in favor, vote aye?

(Chorus of ayes.)

Any opposed or abstentions? Okay, that one carries. Thank you, so much for that.

So Dr. Lyons, we're going to do your report and then -- and the reason I wanted to move this is because he has some students that he wants to introduce to us that made us proud and those students have class tonight and we don't want to keep them out of their class.
PRESIDENT LYONS: Thank you, Madam Chair and members of the Board. A few weeks ago, Mrs. Lyons and I traveled to Torrance, California to attend the Honda Campus All-Star Challenge sponsored by American Honda. And I do want the record to be clear, Madam Chair, that American Honda paid for my coach fare. And I paid for Mrs. Lyons' coach fare. So I want the record clear.

It was an outstanding opportunity to travel and witness our students who were part of the great 48 schools that attended. Some of you are familiar with in the days of the College Bowl, that competition. And our students just represented us so well that I wanted to introduce them to you tonight. There is a conflict with their schedules, but I wanted to ask someone who came up here a few moments ago and claimed that he was retiring after 47 years. I don't know if that's really the case or not, but this person has been our face in the Honda All-Star Challenge Competition and I wanted to ask Dr. Willie Faye
Garrett if she would come forward and introduce
the coach and the team members who are here.

(Applause.)

DR. GARRETT: I am delighted to have
this opportunity mostly because I've had a
wonderful time. I can talk loud. I've had an
enjoyable time being a member of the University
of the District of Columbia faculty. This has
been my dream job. Even though I've gotten other
degrees, I'm an attorney and all that. I've
never left this. This has been my base. I've
loved being a member of university community.
And you can count on me to still be here. I'm
not leaving. I'm on a leave because I have a
100-year-old mother who is going on 101. And
somebody has to go to California to take care of
her and I'm the only divorced member of the
family. So I got the job.

But we had a great time in California.

I did, while I was in California, take time out
and fly down to be with the team. And the team
members here today are -- not all, we have two
more here, but I'll give you a list of everyone
and then introduce who is here.

First of all, the replacement coach of
the team is now Mr. Ebert Burwell.

(Applause.)

He is an alumni of the university and
a former member of the Honda team who spent 11
years assisting me. So you might say I set him
up to have this job. And he is doing an
excellent job. Our captain this year is Mr.
Andreas Smith. Right here in the front.

(Applause.)

The other three team members were
Robin Gilbreath, who is a graduating senior. We
will miss her. Nequil Taborn and Ally Walton.

Our institution rep this year was Dr. Elgloria
Harrison who went to California with the team and
our campus coordinator was Professor Maxine
LeGall. You will be losing Dr. LeGall this year,
too. While we're doing a rebuilding of the Honda
Campus All-Star Challenge whole management thing,
we know that as members of the university you
will work to keep this team functioning. We have had a team Honda for 24 of the 25 years that this competition has been in existence and we have taken a lot of great prizes. We hope to continue to do so and you can count on me to continue to support this university and this team. Thank you.

(Applause.)

PRESIDENT LYONS: Thank you, Dr. Garrett. Two of the other team members that she mentioned were here and they elect to return to class.

A few items. I did want to report to you about the Million Dollar Match campaign. The university did achieve its goal of matching the D.C. Council's million dollars and, in fact, we raised $1,070,000 by the April 10th deadline.

(Applause.)

And while we will provide you with some -- with the breakdown of the contributors and participation rates, etcetera, I did want to indicate that the University of the District of
Columbia Foundation collected $303,000 of that and the David L. Clark School of Law collected $706,000 of that.

(Applause.)

So we're happy to have met the match and we do hope that the Council will put at least another $2 million on the table to challenge the university. And I want to thank Mike Rogers and his team for providing leadership on that.

The budget here and I do want to personally on the record, Madam Chair, thank the faculty, staff, and students who went down to the City Council and made the case for the restoration of the $3.5 million. It was important to us that when we left the budget hearing that the Council understood that that was a real hit to the university. We also lost money, as you know, in our operating budget. They zeroed out next year. And I was very pleased because nearly everybody really took care of business and said the kind of things that the Council members needed to hear about this. And
we cannot dress this up in any way. A $3.5 million hit will hurt. And so our goal now is to try to get it restored. The Council chair seems to be supportive, but he's got to find enough votes on the Council to restore that money.

We intend to have meetings with some of the Council members between now and the time that the committee will vote on the budget and then argue our case. As you probably understand, in order to add $3.5 million for us, they have got to take it from somewhere else and that's where it gets difficult because nobody will want to give up their money. But we're going to continue to make the case until the Council has finished its budget.

As we have been saying for a while now, the Tom Joyner Foundation has identified the University of the District of Columbia to be the College of the Month for the month of May. But more recently, we learned that Tom Joyner and Sybil and Jay Anthony and company will do their show from the Dennard Plaza on May 14th. They
will actually come to campus and set up and the show will be there. I hope that when they used to have this show, people just came out of the woodwork with checks for the University of the Month, making presentations. And I hope that the Washington, D.C. community will follow. But it's going to be a real feather in the cap of this university to actually have the Tom Joyner Morning Show broadcast live from this campus on the 14th. So please stay tuned with that.

Michael Rogers, sir, would you come forward and make comments about the trustee election?

MR. ROGERS: Mr. President, Madam Chair, members of the Board of Trustees, it's over. That's a good thing. We conducted the alumni trustee election from January 5th. Votes were in on March 20th. There were four candidates for three positions. In this election, we had 1103 votes cast. That's more than last time, five years ago, which is an improvement. We also had -- that was three
percent of the alumni participated.

It's not where we wanted to be, but it's going in the right direction. It's moving up.

So after ten days, there were no protests. This was a clean election and so we have three candidates eligible for installation on May 15th, I believe is the day. Trustee Jerome Shelton was elected. Ms. Gwendolyn Hubbard Lewis was elected. And Mr. Barrington Scott was elected. Those are the three that are eligible. We provided the information to the secretary of the Board and at the appropriate time, the new trustees will be eligible to be sworn in by the Office of Protocol of the District of Columbia.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Before you leave, I wanted to -- you have the names there?

MR. ROGERS: Yes.

PRESIDENT LYONS: As part of the Tom Joyner activity, in honor of his father, he identifies a group called Hercules Scholars. His
father's first name was Hercules and so they ask each institution to identify four male persons to be recognized and they will recognize a Hercules Scholar per week during that month.

Would you identify the persons?

MR. ROGERS: I would assert additionally that one of the requirements that the nominees for the Hercules Scholarship have a 3.5 or above, be involved in community activities, leadership activities. After consultation with the deans and the provost, we had more nominees than four, but the ones that were selected were Andreas Smith, a GPA of 3.93, majoring in Business Management, a junior, Class of '16; Joseph Baggett, GPA 4.0, Early Childhood Education, junior, Class of 2016; Melvin Bogart, GPA 4.0, Journalism Communication. He's a junior. And Haro Ya Tua. If he's in the room, if I messed it up. I'm sorry. But he has a 4.0 and he's in Water Resources Management and he's also a junior. So we have four great representatives who will be profiled on the Tom
Joyner Show during the month of May.

We are doing a taping here on campus of each Hercules Scholar. We will put those interviews on our website and they will also go on the Tom Joyner Foundation website during that month.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Thank you. All right. Madam Chair, the final item I want to -- we've talked a lot about the importance of enrollment and we've had our assistant provosts for enrollment management come and visit. But I wanted to let you know that our deans and our athletic director are working very hard in the area of recruitment and retention and so I wanted you to know the kinds of things that they have been doing on this important item. Take it with you. You will have the opportunity to raise any questions you might have, but our deans and our athletic director are doing an awful lot as you can see, some very creative ideas and activities, but to also contribute to the big challenge that we have for enrollment and retention. At another
time, I would certainly be happy to talk with you
about their efforts and activities and direct you
appropriately. So thank you very much, Madam
Chair.

CHAIR CRIDER: Thank you. Next item
on the agenda, we'll move to a resolution. There
are two action items. Actually, there are three
including the executive appointments that we'll
deal with.

The first resolution is Notice of
Proposed Rulemaking, amendments to Chapter 7
updating tuition rates for Academic Year 2016-
'17.

Are you doing that?

PRESIDENT LYONS: No, Madam Chair, I
am not.

CHAIR CRIDER: Is this coming from
you? Okay, the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking,
this is coming out of -- is it coming out of a
committee? Out of Audit, Budget, and Finance.

And you want to handle this Jerome?

MR. SHELTON: Yes.
CHAIR CRIDER: I'm sorry Trustee Shelton.

MR. SHELTON: Can I paraphrase? Okay,

Notice of Proposed Rulemaking amendments to Chapter 7, updating tuition rates for AY 2016-17. Whereas, the District of Columbia law provides for the Board of Trustees of the University of the District of Columbia to fix tuition to be paid by residents and non-resident students attending the university, provided that such tuition is adopted by the trustees in accordance with the provisions of D.C. Official Code 2-505(a); and whereas the university consists of a flagship, urban, land grant university offering a broad range of academic and professional programs including a community college, offering workforce development opportunities, academic certifications, and academic associate degrees, and a law school's mission is to recruit and enroll students from groups under represented at the bar, provide a well-rounded, theoretical, and practical legal education that will enable
students to be effective, ethical advocates and represent the legal needs of low income District of Columbia residents through the school's legal clinics.

And whereas, this university is trying to avoid sporadic significant tuition increases and trying instead to maintain existing cost structures consistent with the rate of inflation by implementing consistent incremental increases.

And whereas, the academic year, 2016-17 tuition rate will be increased by 2.6 percent based on the Calendar Year 2014 rate of consumer price index of 1.6.

Be it resolved that the Board of Trustees of the University of the District of Columbia and I'm sorry I'm not paraphrasing, but I think it's important to go through it, hereby takes proposed rulemaking action to amend Chapter 7 of the university rules, Title 8(b) DCMR to increase tuition to the rates as indicated in the attached Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.

Be it further resolved that the
general counsel is hereby directed to publish
this notice of proposed rulemaking in the D.C.
Register as soon as is practical for a comment
period of not less than 30 days in accordance
with the provisions of the D.C. Official Code 2-
505(a). Submitted for appropriate action and
approval by the Board.

I make the motion as the presenter and
it needs a second, Madam Chair.

MR. TARDD: I'll second.

CHAIR CRIDER: It's been moved and
seconded. Discussion? Mr. Askew.

MR. ASKEW: Madam Chair, just a quick
question. So what is -- so it's being moved on
based on the index which I know we voted, but I'm
just trying to figure out what was the overall
effect of how much in absolute dollars? What
does that really mean?

MR. SHELTON: It's a chart here.

There's a chart for residents, increased amount
per credit hour is $7.37. For Metropolitan
members, it's $8.52 per credit hour. And for
non-residents it's $15.45 per credit hour. And there will be a chart that's published with the presentation for the public which will allow them to review the information and respond, but for the information of the Board, it is included in our packet and all the supporting are present that we need in order to go forward.

MR. ASKEW: Just one last other question, and so the proposed increase will result of how much in additional revenue?

CHAIR CRIDER: Jackie?

MS. XU: Jackie Xu, Director of Institutional Research. So the question was how much total tuition revenue increase this will bring?

MR. ASKEW: Yes.

MS. XU: The estimated number is about $700,000.

MR. ASKEW: Okay. $700,000.

CHAIR CRIDER: Trustee Tardd.

MR. TARDD: If I remember correctly, you raised tuition last year for this year and
enrollment went down. One of the things that the
Admissions Office said is that they were going to
survey students to find out why they were not
returning to the institution. I'm just curious
as to what impact having raised tuition had on
how they responded, what impact it had on the
decrease in enrollment?

CHAIR CRIDER: Do we know that?

MS. XU: Historically, back to '09 and
'10, the university doubled the tuition rate
compared to what we had before that. However,
the enrollment number actually increased after we
significantly increased tuition rates. And after
that, we had two or three small increases because
of the CPI Class 1 resolution.

The enrollment number in recent years
slightly decreased in some programs, but
increased in other programs. So we do not see a
clear correlation between the CPI Class 1 and the
enrollment changes. Therefore, for this proposed
resolution, we assume the enrollment is flat. We
use that assumption to be the base for the
estimated tuition revenue increase because we
have no other reason to say this is going to
increase or decrease enrollment numbers. Our
enrollment numbers basically has been pretty flat
in the last two or three years with small
increases at some programs and small increases at
others.

CHAIR CRIDER: Trustee Wyner.

MR. WYNER: So I think the bigger
decrease we see is not enrollment in the first
year, but is, in fact, is students who leave
without getting a degree, who don't persist. Do
we have -- have we surveyed, have we talked to
students who are leaving about the reasons
they're leaving and the role that finances are
playing in that? I understand that the
correlations, I mean with the economy we know
that there are decreases in enrollment across the
country, as the economy heats up, enrollment goes
down. So that's a pretty standard thing. But in
terms of our completion rate, I'm curious whether
we know anything about why students are leaving
and what the connection might be to finances.

MS. XU: The only such follow-up I know in the university is actually when students graduate. We survey their experience. But when the students leave us, they often don't give us notification, so we don't know that they left until after the fact. I'm not sure if we ever did any follow-up on those groups of students. Our office did some study where they went after they left us. Did they go to other institutions? Or they actually went to work for us or did they just drop out of higher education? The data actually shows very small percentage of them went to other institutions, none of any of the local institutions, not more than three of our students. Most of them dropped out of the higher education system based on the National Student Clearinghouse Data.

MR. WYNER: So when they're leaving us, what I'm hearing you say is that, in fact, they are not completing their degrees elsewhere?

MS. XU: No, most of them.
MR. WYNER: So it's significant that we find out why they are leaving us because it sounds as though we are, in essence, in their experience, really the only opportunity at higher ed. that they're going to have immediately. Now they may return two, three, four, five years down the clearinghouse data, depending on how long you've tracked. It may not show that. But we know that the longer that period of time between enrollment is, the less chance they're going to return to higher ed.

MS. XU: We do have a high number of re-admit students every year and the retention rate for re-admit students is lower than other groups. So they repeatedly drop out from us.

MR. WYNER: Thank you.

CHAIR CRIDER: Mr. Shelton?

MR. SHELTON: One of the triggers that disrupted the flow of increasing tuition and the re-enrollment is that we went through a process where we had to take into consideration the healthcare programs that were being instituted
and we thought that that would have a significant impact. And so we didn't have consistent increases. So yes, we had an increase and then we had a stop of the increase, and now we're re-starting again because of necessity. So those are all factors when they talk about dropping out.

The students were challenged about their healthcare and it was a kind of gray area for a while until it shook itself out. And I think the staff did a good job of holding us in check until we could get an idea of what was going on. And now we're back to following the plan that we had laid out in order to support the university.

MR. TARDD: I understand. Would it be appropriate to propose that we follow up to find out why students are dropping out? That there be some survey or something of the students who fail to return and then we can answer these questions to find out whether it's finances, whether it's something else.
MR. WYNER: There are practices and the parallel so there are colleges around the country that are doing this and doing it well. The parallel is surveys of students after they graduate to find out what their workforce outcomes are. And many of those surveys will only have a 10 or 15 percent return rate, but there are community colleges like Monroe and Rochester, New York that have a 70 percent return rate on those surveys. So there are ways of getting that information through surveys that we might replicate.

And it's important that we really make an effort to try to get a reasonable return rate because often the people who will first return those surveys, as you know, you're the researcher, are the ones who are actually in the best shape. And people don't want to report I'm on public assistance or I'm unemployed or I'm homeless. I'm not suggesting they are, we just don't know. But those are the least likely to report back. So I think a rigorous assessment of
the students who are not succeeding will be welcome.

PRESIDENT LYONS: I will follow up with Jackie and her staff. I think that's an excellent idea.

CHAIR CRIDER: Let me just ask also do we know if there's a difference in the rate of dropping out for community college versus the flagship students?

MS. XU: The retention rate for flagship and community college students are about the same.

CHAIR CRIDER: About the same.

MS. XU: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

MS. XU: First year retention rate.

MR. WYNER: And what is that?

MS. XU: It's about between, around 60.

CHAIR CRIDER: Sixty percent?

MS. XU: Yes. Retention rate, 60 percent.
MR. SHELTON: Retention rate.

MS. XU: Return rate, 60 percent.

MS. BENNETT: I just have pretty much two questions. Do you know how many meetings where held with students about the proposed increase, about how many town halls or information sessions or something?

MS. XU: I personally don't have any knowledge on the student activity side.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Dr. Epps, would you respond?

MS. BENNETT: The reason I ask is because we have to find out -- some of the questions that we are asking here today about why people leave, if you're talking to the students when this is in the process, I think you'll get some insightful information as to some of those things.

DR. EPPS: Initially, when we decided on the CPI+1, we did hold town hall meetings both on our campus, on the flagship campus, as well as the community college. However, this past year,
there were not any meetings in regard to the
increase for this year.

We did hold meetings in regard to the
proposed fee increases, both at the community
college and here on the flagship, but we did not
in terms of the tuition increase this year.

MS. BENNETT: Thank you.

CHAIR CRIDER: I thought you had one
more question, right?

MS. BENNETT: I did actually. I think
Ms. Xu, you mentioned that we will get $700,000
in revenue from this proposed increase. Do we
have any match with that as to the rationale as
to how -- will we increase services effort to
students? How will we be using this revenue from
tuition to impact student retention and their
persistence in finishing?

MS. XU: At this time, we haven't
started Fiscal Year '17 budget formulation
process yet. So I don't know if I can answer
that question until the Budget Committee gets
together to review the overall revenue situation
and protected expenditure, all of that pieces
together in order to answer that question.

CHAIR CRIDER: Trustee Askew and then
Trustee Bell.

MR. ASKEW: And this may be for Dr. Epps, and maybe the provost can answer. Do we
when we put out our information on tuition, is
there a section in there that says that tuition
will increase based upon CPI? I mean do we
provide notice so that students who are entering
into the institution know on the front end that
tuition will increase? I think there are other
institutions that do the exact same thing to be
quite honest with you.

So I'm just wondering if that is a
form of notice to entering as well as existing
students. Because it is something that we passed
a resolution that basically said that's what
we're going to do each year. And the only reason
it won't happen is if the Board decides that it
doesn't want to do that. So I'm just wondering
do we provide some notice of that? And if not,
maybe we can think about how we can do that.

MS. XU: I don't know if we provide personal notice about it, but I think our website the tuition page says university reserves the right to make changes to tuition rates. I think that's what it says.

MS. BENNETT: Well, I think what Trustee Askew is pointing out is that that's just a vague statement, the university can raise it. But we already have something concrete that we know for certainty that it will be that number. So I think we should find a way how to include that into the packets for our incoming students.

MS. PETTY: I'll have to check to see whether we disclose. There's no reason that we can't, although I remember having this discussion with Dwight and it was my impression that we brought it back to the Board for approval each year and so to disclose it, I don't know. But we can certainly have discussions internally and if that's helpful I don't see a reason that we won't.
MR. ASKEW: And again, I think it would just be helpful and again, you can put a statement about the Board because right now the policy is you know, I think there's a way and that may address some of the questions that may come up related to did we really know?

CHAIR CRIDER: Right, the Board can choose not to implement the fee increase like we did two years ago when the insurance rates went up. But it is our policy that we will increase CPI+1 percent each year. I think that's what you're looking for in student handbook or recruiting materials that may go out to students wherever it is appropriate to put that.

MS. PETTY: We can work internally to draft something and bring it back to Academic Affairs and Student Affairs to look at.

CHAIR CRIDER: Any other discussion?

VICE CHAIR BELL: I have a question. Jackie, can you tell us, I think that when we increased tuition last time we expected about $700,000 in revenue from that increase and I'm
just wondering, this is in response to Trustee Bennett's question, how much of that did we actually realize because tuition -- I mean enrollment did go down.

Do you have a sense of against that anticipated $700,000 where we actually came out?

MS. XU: Well, because the projection tuition revenue increase is totally based on a model, assuming all your students pay the amount they're supposed to pay you, right?

VICE CHAIR BELL: Right.

MS. XU: So the actual collection often is less than that projected number.

VICE CHAIR BELL: Right.

MS. XU: So it's hard to determine what comes from the tuition increase, what comes from the better collection or whatever. So I have never done any analysis to try to differentiate these two. But overall tuition revenue did go down because the enrollment went down.

CHAIR CRIDER: Trustee Wyner.
MR. WYNER:  So, correct me if I'm wrong. Am I to understand that we don't discount -- that $700,000 is based on an assumption that every student will pay the full amount? It's not discounted by the historical rate of the students' discount rate?

MS. XU:  Based on the historical data, it's about eight percent discount rate. So when I compared last year to this year to get the $700,000, that total amount was discounted by eight percent. So the difference -- yes.

MR. WYNER:  Thank you.

CHAIR CRIDER:  Other questions or discussion?

MR. WYNER:  Call for the question, Madam Chair.

CHAIR CRIDER:  All in favor of the tuition increase, vote aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Any opposed? Or abstentions?

MR. WYNER:  I'm going to abstain. If I could just say that last year I was new to the
The Board, voted for this, but did ask that we think about the impact on student success and given the lack of information we have about that, I'm not comfortable voting for this tuition increase.

At the same time, I recognize that the institution is now, if we were to vote against this, could be put in a bind. But I would strongly urge that the Board and the leadership of the institution provide us that information with any future requests for tuition increases. I think we need to understand just on the pure revenue side, I think we need to understand what we believe the impact on enrollment might be, right? I mean our revenues are enrollment times tuition minus the discount rate, minus how much students don't either get scholarships or don't actually, we can't collect. So just on the revenue side.

And the second is I think the students that we're serving, this is their only opportunity for public education. And I think it's really important that we understand what the
impact on completion might be. It's not just
about enrollment. It's on their opportunity to
finish their degrees.

The one other thing I will say is I
would be interested, a lot of colleges around the
country will front load scholarship support to
get students in the door. And so sophomores or
juniors or seniors are actually paying not just
the tuition increase, but they're seeing their
scholarships come down and that's a recruiting
methodology. And so I don't know the extent to
which we do that, but I would be interested in
those facts as well because that also could have
an impact on completion.

But I do think we know that the
biggest reasons students don't complete from all
of the surveys done has to do with money. It has
to do with the fact that they have to earn money
in jobs and that that combination of the foregone
revenue from not working and of tuition is
causing them not to complete. I think we've got
to have the information to make these decisions
if we're here to serve students. So I will stop
with that, but I am abstaining in this vote and
would ask that in all future tuition increase
requests that we have good information about what
we know about the impact on students.

CHAIR CRIDER: I think in addition to

that --

MS. LEMUS: Can I say something? This

is Gabby.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes, Trustee Lemus.

MS. LEMUS: I concur with what's just

been stated. I myself am very uncomfortable with

continually raising rates without a real

assessment of where we are.

It seems clear that people's wages

aren't going up in the same levels as our rates.

And even if people are working while in school, I

shouldn't say even if, I should say because

people while they're in school, it just puts them

in an awkward situation that unless overall wages

raise in the country, they're stuck between a

rock and a hard place. And I really just want to
see us be sensitive to that until there is an
adjustment in the economy, which could take a
while, but it may be unreasonable from the
perspective of the university. But I think it's
reasonable for the students and for the value
that we're bringing to this community in the
District of Columbia.

CHAIR CRIDER: Thank you. I think the
other thing that we were to measure goes to one
of the areas in the strategic plan which had to
do with a projected increase in enrollment. And
we haven't seen that as I recall, correct?

MR. TARDD: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: And so in addition to
looking at the impact of the tuition increases,
we also need to have some information back in
terms of enrollment growth so we can look at all
of these pictures together.

Trustee Dyke.

MR. DYKE: I just want to make one
observation and this falls in the category of
gratuitous, but I think all these questions and
concerns are very, very legitimate. But we also
have to put them into context of the fact that
literally every higher ed. institution in the
country is having to raise tuition because for
whatever reason governments that generally
support them are backing off. And at some point
we're going to have to have some adjustment made
because we can't keep reducing how much we
subsidize higher ed. and basically leaving it to
the institution to make the cuts because the
students are the ones that are suffering as a
result of that.

So I think all these questions are
very legitimate, but it also points out the fact
that we are having to deal now with a situation
in the District where we're taking a hit at a
time when we're trying to deal with some of our
own issues and addressing questions like how do
we keep the tuition at a rate that people can
afford, especially at a time when students are
looking for options? But it also emphasizes the
fact that we need to focus on -- I gather there's
going to be a hearing, maybe in June, there's some legislation the Council is looking at having to do with free community college tuition which obviously would have a significant impact on what we're doing, but we need to be looking at all these other options that play into what the cost of higher ed. is.

CHAIR CRIDER: Well, it clearly --

MS. LEMUS: I'd like to --

CHAIR CRIDER: Can you give a second, just one second? I think that part of the question becomes where do they get the free tuition?

MR. DYKE: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: So we've certainly got to make sure that we're all for anything that benefits the students at the community college, but it can't come --

MR. DYKE: It can't come from our heart.

CHAIR CRIDER: Exactly. It can't come as a result of some decreases or things that
might hurt the flagship students. We've got two
sets of students, three sets including the law
school and we've got to make sure that we take
care of. So I always get a little nervous when
they start to talk about doing something that in
the past has led to reductions for the flagship
location.

MR. DYKE: Well, that's why when that
particular issue was discussed, we need to be
there making that case.

CHAIR CRIDER: Absolutely.

MR. DYKE: To the extent you're going
to step up, if you're going to give us a mandate,
then you need to provide the funds to pay for it.

CHAIR CRIDER: Exactly. Trustee

Lemos?

MS. LEMUS: Yes, thank you. So my
reaction to that comment is I concur that we
should not pit the community college against the
university first. And second, obviously, we
can't -- we have to figure out a way to ensure
that whatever the approach is is balanced.
However, I also think it's incumbent upon us as trustees, as leaders of this university, to figure out alternative ways to raise additional funds, not just depend on the government. Unfortunately, as much as I -- I pay my taxes. My real estate is going up and all going to education, I hope. But if it isn't, then what are we going to do as leaders to ensure that we can raise more money? And I do believe it's possible.

I think we just need to really focus on a strategic plan of about how we're going to do this. And I know how difficult it is. On the other hand, I just hesitate right now, given current economic circumstances in the city where the people at large -- nobody's wages are going up in this town, nobody's. And that's a problem. Unless you're part of the 1 percent, you're the only one that's making your cash.

So I don't mean to be overly political, but it just strikes me that we should be thinking more broadly about where our
resources are coming from.

CHAIR CRIDER: Trustee Bell.

VICE CHAIR BELL: I was going to say,

Trustee Lemos, I mean I think we all agree. No

one likes to do these tuition increases. I think

the 2020 plan speaks to opportunities for rev.

regeneration and I think also seriously we have

to look at cost-cutting measures and also ways to

contain unfunded mandates that get put upon us.

So we're actively looking at all of those as well

as the alumni contributions and seeing how we can

increase those so that we don't have to do these

tuition increases. It's not fun for anybody.

MS. LEMUS: Understood.

CHAIR CRIDER: Trustee Shelton.

MR. SHELTON: The administrative

ventured an option of planning a three year, a

prolonged budget over a period of time. We have

not resisted that. One of the strategies that

when you're trying to manage your money is to

have a plan over a period of years that you're

trying to implement for just money. We have not
been able to pull that together and I encourage
the administration to go back to that concept and
look at a three or five-year plan based on a
fixed amount of money so that we can begin to
baseline the university and then do the other
outreach resource development activities to
supplement. But we don't have a three-year
baseline. We've been jerked every year up and
down. So we have to find our own core and work
from there.

And that idea was floated by
administration. We weren't quite ready to
investigate it, but I encourage them to go back
to that concept because it's very effective for
long range money management.

CHAIR CRIDER: Thank you, Trustee
Shelton. Okay, and speaking of unfunded
mandates, the next resolution on the agenda is
801 North Capitol Street location.

Trustee Askew?

MR. ASKEW: Yes, we voted. The vote
was taken and it was not confirmed by the
chairman. You did not say it carried or it
didn't carry.

CHAIR CRIDER: That motion carried.

I'm sorry.

MR. ASKEW: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Let me just say just a few words and I'll try to
keep this as short as possible. The Government
Operations Committee in February voted to begin
to transition programs from the 801 North Capitol
location to a university-owned location. The
context that I want to give is that from the very
beginning, we have no desire to move from 801
North Capitol Street. However, as has been
alluded to a little earlier, we do have some
unfunded mandates and that means that we have a
community college at 801 North Capitol Street
where we are paying approximately and I think
it's over $5 million per year and we do not have
the finances to support that. In fact, we don't
have $4 million. We don't have $5 million to
support our presence at 801 North Capitol Street.

We all understand that it is a prime
location. I think that there are people who are in this room who worked to get us a location that would support our desire to have branch campus status, but it's also true that what was planned did not happen. What was planned was that the university would be in a position to actually purchase the building. We were going to do that by getting the -- the administration was going to work with the chief financial officer to take the university outside of the budget cap of the District of Columbia. Well, although the leadership had expressed that there was buy-in for that by the CFO, the CFO came back, whether it was political pressure or not, and said that they were not willing to do that.

And so we also had a strategy that if, in fact, we were able to not be included in the District's debt cap that we would go secure favorable funding from the Department of Education, the HBCU section to get favorable interest rates on the purchase of the building. And again, it did not happen.
Now what was the result of that? You know, our first year or two and Mr. Thompson can provide the better numbers, the more accurate numbers, but the result of that is that we started in a building where we were getting credits. We were getting rent abatement. Later on, our abatements ran out and not only were we subject to paying a lease on a monthly basis, but we were subject to increasing lease space expense.

So we have as the institution sought to get the District to recognize the position that we are in. In fact, last year, we went to the administration and we asked in our supplemental budget for their support to pay our lease for the year. We received no response. And no response isn't no in the District of Columbia. This year we are faced with a $3.5 million shortfall at the District of Columbia which means they're reducing our total amount of the budget that we are getting, despite the fact that inflation continues to go up. Market rates
continue to go up. And in addition to that, for 2016, it looks like they zeroed out our capital budget.

So again, this brings us to the point where we're not talking about leaving a place just to leave it. We are in the position where we have to really think about what are our options? And so tasked, the committee tasked the administration and particularly our real estate department and eventually our CEO, the community college, the provost, and there may be one other person to come up with some options.

I will just remind you all that we started talking about the relocation of the 801 community college programs way back when we started Vision 20-20. And for those of you who don't recall, just take a look at Vision 20-20. It was an issue then.

We then had committee meetings on -- we didn't make any immediate decisions and we may be paying some of the price for that. But in December of 2014, we had a committee meeting. We
went through options. In February of 2015, we had another presentation and we eventually took some action. And now we are -- and then we have another committee meeting just again to perfect and to give greater detail as to what the plan would be in April. And I think in April we have reached a point where we can demonstrate that we looked at, one, we've talked to the appropriate parties, the CEO, the CEO of the community college who was at the meeting in December. She was at the meeting in February. And I can't remember whether she was at the meeting in May and actually the CEO represented the institution, I believe, at the December meeting.

And so now we're at a point where we've looked at -- we've evaluated, the administration has evaluated three options and what we wanted to make clear and what we didn't make clear at our last Government Operations meeting, the ask was to help us look at other options that would lead to some efficiencies for the university. Right? Do we have space at our
other locations? And the answer is yes. We're not fully utilizing these spaces we have here at 4200 North Capitol Street. We're not utilizing all of our space that we are building at Bertie Backus. And I won't even mention P.R. Harris because we're not going to go there. But we have explored all of those options and we've looked at potentially relocating to Building 41. We asked the administration to really give us a recommendation again that focuses on cost savings, but that could deliver really a better product than what we offer today. And I think that we've seen in the past when we look at our movement from with the law school and the school of business that sometimes when you're moving, it actually works out better than what it was before.

The goal is not to move people into a facility that is not up to par or is not better than what you may be receiving today. And I think we all, those of us who have been to the community college on a crowded day and those of
us who have talked to community college students,
those of us who have talked to community college
faculty members, I understand that sometimes
things can get a little tight from the parking
lot to inside the building.

So I think that when you look at the
proposals that we had today and again, our
recommendation is to begin to transition the
community college programs into university-owned
facilities.

When we look at the numbers and again,
we can all get into the specifics. Everyone had
had access to the specifics from probably day one
that we started having conversations about this,
but the level of detail now that's available, I
mean, it's so much further, so much beyond where
we first started. And if you want data, again,
you can bring up Eric Thompson to give you some
more information. But again, what we're looking
at today is not only transitioning, keeping in
mind that there are some accreditation matters
that through this transition, we will have to
work out.

Today, we have branch campus status with Middle States full knowledge that we operate out of different locations, Bertie Backus, Van Ness, and 801 North Capitol Street. The Middle States fully understands and wants us to be financially prudent, right? And to stay in a facility that we can afford and we have space and we can deliver on an even better product or at least create a better environment in my mind is what Middle States would want to see that we're managing and leveraging our resources the best that we possibly can.

Again, I apologize for going on about that, but I did want to give some context because sometimes there's these rumors that just because you're trying to do the right thing for the institution, you're trying to harm something and that's just not the case. It hasn't been the case. This has been an inclusive process from day one to the time that we are today. And again, I know that there is some sensitivities
associated with this. I would just ask folks just to focus on not necessarily the structure or the structure of the building, but what happens inside the building and I believe we've got the talent at this institution. Whether the program is here or whether it's at Backus or if, in fact, somehow the District comes up with the $5 million per year and they have it today and they haven't said that they're even considering it, then you know, we may be able to have another conversation.

Members of the Board, again, there is a whole lot of detail that's included in your packet and if you want even more detail we can certainly provide that. I would just ask Mr. Thompson, if he could just give us some brief information on the proposed recommendation by the administration as it relates to the building that we're primarily looking at and we're moving into, recognizing that none of these plans are perfect.

So if you're looking for a perfect plan, this is not where you need to be. Our
plans for our law school and our school of
business, they haven't been perfect, however, we
are so far along and much better and in a much
better position than we are today. So if you're
looking for something perfect, it just doesn't
exist.

The student center is not perfect.
The student center, as we all know, we overran
our costs and it has taken us a little longer,
but we have the talent to adjust and I think we
are in a position, in a forced position almost
where are having to look at how to more
effectively utilize the assets that are available
to us.

MR. THOMPSON:  Good evening, Dr.
Lyons, Dr. Crider, Board Members. My name is
Eric Thompson. I'm the Director of Real Estate
and Capital Construction for the University. If
I could piggyback on the Trustee's comments. The
evolution of his evaluation started from just
looking at this from a bricks and mortar
standpoint to including a much more diverse group
of people on our investigation team to look at how the bricks and mortar can make sense. But in some ways more importantly, how we can minimize the impact on the academic side of the house.

We investigated multiple options to satisfy the directive given from the Operations Committee. The option that we are recommending this evening is the Building 41/Library renovation option. I'll give a brief summary of what is included inside of that plan. At 801 North Capitol, there's approximately 54,000 net assignable square feet of space, separate from restrooms with the walls, mechanical areas, elevators, just the actual program with classrooms, offices, and meeting spaces, approximately 54,000 net assignable square feet.

Building 41, within the building the LRB or library area is approximately 56,000 square feet. This plan would utilize roughly 40,000 square feet within that space at the existing library and take 14,000 square feet, the net result of removing 40,000 square from 801.
That 14,000 square that's left over is mostly
dedicated to nursing space and would be moved to
the Backus campus.

There's an existing floor within the
Backus building that is currently leased to the
Department of Employment and Services that is
exactly 14,000 square feet. The nursing space
would take over that with a renovational net
floor to help it support the exact programs that
are offered at 801. The library in Building 41
now will be relocated and consolidated to the B
level of Buildings 38 and 39. What is currently
in that location is the Law School library and
the Firebird Inn and the 4.0 Lounge. The Law
School library would be relocated to Building 52,
closer to the law school. And the occupants
currently of the Firebird Inn and the 4.0 Lounge
move into the student center when that building
is complete.

The end result of the library
relocation would take out 56,000 square feet of
library space that is within building 41 and
consolidate that to what we're estimating to be roughly 27,000 square feet of space on that B level of Buildings 38 and 39.

The proposal we identify will cost roughly between $12.3 and $17 million and we're looking a span of time based on the information that's available right now of 12 to 38 months. The difference in the span of time and the difference in the costs is based mostly on our unknowns right now about the available capital dollars with the Mayor's proposed reduction in capital funding. But whether we keep the proposed -- the exact $64 million we have right now through the six years or it is truly reduced to the $55, working with the chief financial officer, we've identified the availability of funds within that window of costs to support the project.

I think it's important to note with the estimated cost of design services which will be the very next step, to take our in-house estimates based on costs per square foot, looking
at how much we're spending on classrooms, nursing, science space on existing projects to help develop these numbers, getting a design team and engineering team to developing drawings to actually look at the renovations in Building 41, to actually look at the renovation and supplemental activities that need to happen in Backus. We will finalize those actual construction numbers and at that time come back to the Board for approval of those contracts which we anticipate the largest one, that being in Building 41 to exceed the $4 million range.

I am open for any questions that you may have. I think that's a brief version of the more longer conversations we've had as this investigation has evolved over time. I am comfortable that that dollar range and that schedule is the most educated guess we can give you right now and is one that is informed by the Office of the CEO and community college, the Division of Capital Construction, the Office of the Provost and has been vetted, if you will, as
much as it can be.

MR. ASKEW: Erik, can you just -- this is all about cost savings, so can you give that number as well?

MR. THOMPSON: So right now -- yes, I actually can. Right now, as the Trustee alluded to, the structure of the lease gave us 18 months of rent abatement. So on the first 18 months, we were paying essentially operating costs and a very small amount for actually rent in the building with the idea being that we would have two purchase options. Both purchase options passed and at the end of that second purchase option, the rent in the building was intended to go up to not only hit an identified estimate of market value, but to recover the abatement that was experienced in the first couple of years. So there was an initial spike we saw where at one point we were paying even more than market value. Then the lease would level out to go back to what is market value and I believe Year 5, the year we're in now, and then it would go up on an
estimated percentage amount every year throughout
the remaining, at this point 12 years in the
lease.

The analysis we've completed suggests
that should we complete a project in 2017 which
is where -- is our best case scenario with
capital funding and construction contracts and
design contacts starting after an approval this
evening, we will say somewhere between $41 and
$46 million in lease payments alone. I separate
from that lease payment the operating costs
because while we're averaging approximately $2
million a year in operating costs, we do know
additional analysis will identify how much of
that $2 million would still be an operating cost
here at the Van Ness Campus and at Backus. But I
think we are comfortable in saying it would not
remain a total $2 million because some of the
cost in that $2 million is the cost of operating
a space that is remote from the Van Ness Campus.

CHAIR CRIDER: Can we do the motion
and then take questions and then get into the
discussion?

MR. ASKEW: Yes, I move the

resolution, Madam Chair.

CHAIR CRIDER: Is there a second?

MR. TARDD: Second.

CHAIR CRIDER: Moved and seconded.

Discussion?

MR. TARDD: Okay, you said there's a

$2 million operating cost. Of that $5 million

that you're talking about in terms of rent, are

we really talking $3 million or are we talking $5

million? If you back out the operating costs,

what are we talking?

MR. THOMPSON: Trustee Askew alluded
to a second ago, as the rent number goes up,

which is approximately $3 million today, we will

get times through the course of the remaining 12

years where even if we keep the estimated $2

million in operating costs, there are years and

going from the top of my head, I could look at

the actual numbers from the lease, where the

lease payment would be $4 million plus. So in
those years, if we're keeping an operating cost of say $2 million and the lease payment for that year is $4.5, we would be actually paying $6.4 million in that year.

MR. WYNER: But I think you said that not all of those $2 million operating costs would be foregone based on the move?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes. That is a true statement.

MR. WYNER: So how much of the $2 million would we have here after the move? You said some, but not all?

MR. THOMPSON: So my statement is if we stayed in the building. What would be a part of our ongoing analysis is to truly look at if we're recommending Building 41 and we would start looking at operations, the academic operation within 41 to identify what the operating costs would be for that scenario. In large part, to truly answer that question, a full design of how we would function in the building would be needed and then we would take the $2 million estimated
costs for every year at 801 and show the delta
between the two of those that are --

MR. WYNER: So we don't know.

MR. THOMPSON: We do not know at this
point how much of the $2 million we would
actually continue to pay.

MR. WYNER: And similarly, as you
talked about the wide range of costs, and we
don't know about overruns, what I'm hearing you
say also is that $12 to $17 million which is a
pretty wide range, given that we haven't done the
design work makes sense. But we actually don't
know if $12 to $17 is about right until we've
done the design costs. Right? I mean you could
come back and it could be $25, right?

MR. THOMPSON: It is true that we
don't know exactly what the number would be. The
design contract would be such that the architect
would be required to work with the stakeholders
in the project and design to a bid number. So
they would have to identify for us reasons why we
would not be in that range. And because the
construction contracts associated with that
design, we would be coming back to you to
discuss. It would be at that time we would have
to justify that (a) the funding is available and
they would provide a fiscal impact statement.

But then also specifically identify
any reasons why we were off from this range. I
think you bring up a very good point that the
range we're identifying is based on the
information we know today. Costs for other
projects on campus that have similar scopes of
work. Costs for projects in the Backus Building
that we know more about what's behind the walls
at Backus. Educational -- what we know what's
behind the walls here on the Van Ness campus.

But there's a certain level that we won't know at
10,000 feet where we are right now.

CHAIR CRIDER: Trustee Bennett.

MS. BENNETT: I have a few questions
in that regard. How much will it cost to break
the lease, do you know?

MR. THOMPSON: We do not know how much
it would cost to break the lease. In that evolution I spoke of where we started -- we're just thinking of bricks and mortar. And now we've brought in different areas of the university. I think our next steps, assuming we receive approval this evening, would be to bring in even more stakeholder groups to talk about the project. We've recently started working with the Office of the General Counsel. We have a solicitation on the street that I believe is due this Thursday for Real Estate Brokerage Services for the university. So some time after approval of the resolution, we would bring in general counsel and work with a real estate broker to start the conversations with the owner and talk about what it would truly cost to break the lease. Because that is something we also do not know at this time.

The thought has been it has not been appropriate just yet to talk to the owner about breaking the lease when we truly have not had a directive to do that just yet.
VICE CHAIR BELL: And point of information, we're not going to break the lease.

MR. THOMPSON: You're right. That's the wrong terminology.

VICE CHAIR BELL: We will have the lease assigned to someone else or we will sublet portions of it, but it will not be broken.

MR. THOMPSON: I apologize. Breaking the lease is not the right way for me to capture what we will be doing. The lease gives us provision.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

MR. THOMPSON: For finding someone to sublease the building to. The lease gives us provision that if we wanted to have someone take over the lease there's a way in which we can do that with the terms that's in our current agreement.

MS. BENNETT: Okay. So that was important. So what are you asking us to do today? Just to be clear, just to give a go ahead as to moving? Is that what I'm hearing? I'm
hearing that you're not asking us to approve a
budget for this project, neither are you asking
us to decide pretty much anything.

MR. THOMPSON: No, no.

MR. ASKEW: So let me as a member of
the Government Operations Committee, we took a
vote to transition the community college programs
over to 801 North Capitol Street. That now has
to come to the full Board. What we did in
committee was just --

MS. BENNETT: So this is just a move?

MR. ASKEW: Right, so he's providing
with -- exactly, so this is really just a move.
But because there were people who wanted
additional information as to what would the move
really entail and where and what were some of the
financial consequences associated with it? Did
we have the right people talking as we went
through this process? That's why our goal was to
provide more information so that we had at least
an idea of what direction.

So you're right, he's not -- the
recommendation is really more so the transition
out and also the recommendation is is that we --
I think the recommendation is is that we agree on
kind of almost like the dollar associated, like
the $12 to $17 million associated with that
particular one. Because that's what it would
cost in order to make the most.

MS. BENNETT: Well, we don't know.

MR. ASKEW: No, no, no. I don't know
that that's true either. I think Erik did a
pretty good job at explaining to you how we would
go about managing the process so that we got what
we needed based upon the budget that we actually
have. I'm not quite sure that that's any
different than any other capital project that
we've had. And when we said $30 million for the
student center, that was it, right?

MS. BENNETT: You didn't go above
that?

MR. ASKEW: Like I said, we won't know
-- to answer your question is yes, but you really
won't know that until we really get the process
started. Now I will say that this is
distinguished between the student center because
we're not dealing with votes and stuff like that.
So the infrastructure is not as complicated.

MR. THOMPSON: And I think it's good
to note that the significant differences between
the two scenarios is when a budget was identified
for the student center, we didn't have a site
identified, so we didn't know we were going to be
over the Metro. The decision to go LEED Platinum
had not been confirmed, so we did not have that
challenge. And there were the unknowns of the
site itself. We're talking about going to two
buildings that we currently operate within, that
we've done renovations at some point in time.
And we've used that information to base the
estimates we're giving you on.

Now it is construction. There is the
possibility for some unknowns to be discovered
when we truly get into the walls, when we truly
start to repair, if not replace mechanical
systems for Building 41 and the work that would
need to be done at Backus. But it would be at
that time that I would be coming back before you
much like I feel confident I can do now and
explain the difference between a $40 million
project thought and the actual construction costs
we have for the student center.

In this case, explaining to you the
difference between the $12 to $17 million range
we're giving based on cost per square foot that
we tried to clearly identify and an actual
project that is based on an architect going
inside the walls, looking at the mechanical
systems within both buildings, working with the
stakeholders on the academic side, to truly go
from looking at okay, a space within the building
would be 14,000 square feet for nursing and
changing that into -- within that 14,000 square
feet, there are two labs, there are 13 offices,
there are 6 classrooms. They need to have gas.
And that continued evolution of the process is
how we are refining them.

MR. ASKEW: But they're --
CHAIR CRIDER: Trustee Wyner.

MR. WYNER: So I just want to be really clear that at this stage what you understand is the due diligence to be done is significant. This is not recognizing where we are in the process. This is not a criticism of that. I appreciate the documentation you provided as well.

But it sounds to me that we're not sure what the operational savings will be. The costs are still pretty unclear. There is some range. And the exposure associated with subleasing 801, we're not too sure about. We hadn't really investigated what our exposure is. In other words, we can sublease, but we haven't evaluated, I assume, the market associated with subleases in that area. So there are some uncertainty on three different variables on the cost side. Is that a fair statement?

MR. THOMPSON: It is a fair statement.

I will say that of the positives that could have come out of recent news stories after the vote to
investigate this, there have been many entities to contact the university interested in subleasing the building. And we've had conversations with those entities, both municipal entities and otherwise. And because of that, feel comfortable that when we get to that point some sort of deal can be struck to backfill the space we're currently within.

MR. WYNER: But that makes us fully whole where there might be some costs associated with that?

MR. THOMPSON: It would be well beyond where we are to say I know we can get to fully whole. I think we have enough information that suggests we can get to offsetting any costs that currently paying for the lease with a different occupant or someone taking over this.

MR. WYNER: I do want to ask one more question though because you talked a little bit about how the space is here and classrooms being built that should suffice. I trust that that's the case. But I'm assuming there was an original
purpose behind 801 North Capitol Street and I wasn't here at the time that would have something to do with tracking students, that would have something to do with the location of the space. I'm assuming there was some purpose there and I'm curious whether we've done any investigations of the students at all about their willingness to come from 801 here. I mean after all, you can build a classroom, but if you build it sometimes they don't come. And I'm curious how much we know about the students' experience and the likelihood that location matters here.

We know that a lot of our students actually are closer to that location. I don't know whether coming six or seven more stops off the Red Line is going to have an impact on students as compared to here.

In our investigation, have we talked to students or investigated the likely impact on enrollment at the community college? And have we looked historically at what has happened at North Capitol Street and how much we might attribute
that to location versus many of the other things
that are very important to the provision of
education. Is that part of the investigation?

MR. THOMPSON: And to add on that, the
impact on tuition.

MR. ASKEW: So let me just say this
from a numbers standpoint. I think Jackie gave
you the numbers. Jackie told you that the
enrollment in the community college, well, I
would say the community college has been a roller
coaster. Right? That's what she said. So I'm
not sure whether it's the location piece either
because we've actually seen a reduction in people
just as we've seen in the very beginning we may
have seen a little increase. I'm not sure that
location, this particular location, based upon
the data says that the location will lend to us
having more students.

MR. WYNER: Right, no. I think there
is a correlation that's part of the economy that
we've had. I completely agree with you, Trustee
Askew. I think the question I'm having is
whether we've investigated the likely impact.

What information have we gathered in regard to demand and in regard to what students, in fact, want and what might happen as a result of that from moving the nursing program from one location to another the rest from one location to --

CHAIR CRIDER: But there was a plan to move the nursing program from 801 over to Bertie Backus. That plan is still the plan. And so that hasn't changed. And what we're talking about here, you know. As I understood it, and -- I'm trying to remember whether they have moved. I think when I came on the Board they had just moved to 801. The intent at that time was different than I think what the intent is now and that was to have a completely independent community college, not separately accredited, but totally an independent community college. So the first step supposedly in doing that was to get them their own building across town.

So the university goes about,
identifies a building across town, moves the community college there, with no additional funding to support that move. So the university each year has faced budget overruns, I'll call it that for lack of the other term is trying to come into my brain, but I can't think of right now, declining fund balance. We've spent out of the fund balance every year to make up this delta between what our budget is and what we needed to support what is really $8 million in real estate that we never had. We never had money to support that.

At some point, the Board has got to be responsible to say we can't continue to do that. And how do we support the education for all of our students, whether it is 801 North Capitol, whether it's Bertie Backus, whether it's P.R. Harris, or whether it's Van Ness, is we continue to have at least an $8 million hole every year. But now because of the $3.5 million reduction and no capital funds is really $11.5 million this year. We've already run an $8 million a year is
what historically we've run. So now we've got --
I'm saying $11 because the cost of the real
estate that we don't have money to pay for is $8
million.

MR. WYNER: I've seen $41 million as
the estimate for 12 years.

CHAIR CRIDER: That's one year.

That's one building. We've got four buildings
plus an airfield strip.

MR. WYNER: The delta here is this $41
million.

CHAIR CRIDER: That's only because
we're talking about one building. Now if we
wanted to add the other buildings in there, I can
go for that.

MR. WYNER: I'm just trying to get my
arms around the numbers of what we're dealing
with --

CHAIR CRIDER: These numbers are
strictly 802 North Capitol Street.

MR. WYNER: Thank you.

CHAIR CRIDER: But I'm trying to get
you to understand the broader picture of the
financial hole that the university has faced each
year because we've got to manage these buildings
and we have not had the money to pay for them.
We visited downtown. This didn't start this
year. We have been dealing with this for the
five years that I've been on the Board to say we
were mandated to right size. We right sized. We
can't right size our way out of this any more.

And so what we've asked for and I'm
going to thank Joe and the Operations Committee
because they took on this tough issue of looking
at this, coming back, bringing options to us so
that this Board can take some action and not just
continue to sit here and let money go out of here
without any control or act like we're blind that
this is costing us every year.

So I'm going to thank the Operations
Committee for taking this on. I know it's
unpopular. But it's something that we have to do
contrary to popular belief, this is not a bluff.
This is not about I'm going to call your bluff
about us moving. If, in fact, we don't have
money to support it, we're going to have to do
something. So that's kind of where it is.

I'm sorry, don't get me on a roll.

But let me just say, you asked a question about
tuition. Remember, those students were here. I
know it's a different set of students because
many of those students that started out here have
graduated or they've come into the flagship and
some of them are coming up here anyway, but they
were here before. And so we needed a community
college. I believe in the community college. I
don't know that we necessarily needed to be
across town. And as we have revisited this whole
idea of an independent community college, I think
it gives us some flexibility. We will keep these
separate accreditations and the branch campus
status. We're not trying to get rid of that.

Tony and Jim, and then I'm going to be
quiet for a minute.

MR. TARDD: I'll ask a question and
you'll get back into it. My question is I
believe you said in your presentation that we have gone to the mayor. We have gone to this mayor.

MR. ASKEW: We've gone to the previous mayor and this mayor.

MR. TARD: Okay.

MR. ASKEW: As recently as last week.

MR. TARD: And we've asked the city to pick up the cost.

MR. ASKEW: Yes, and they said no, so far. Because no one answers no.

MR. TARD: We went last week.

MR. ASKEW: No, no, no. So two things. So let me respond two ways. One, there's not $9 million in a 2016 budget for us, right? Right? What we have is a $3.5 million reduction in our budget, right? And there is not, in recognition of what we asked for last year, there's nothing in the budget that recognizes that we need the $5 million to stay at 801.

Number two, so let's be clear, though
this was not -- though the current mayor was not
the mayor last year, she certainly was on the
Council, and she did not advocate for it then.
Like Phil is trying to advocate to make us whole
this year. We've gone to them this year. And so
let me be politically correct. So we didn't talk
to the mayor because despite some efforts that
are being made from the Board as well as the
President that meeting has not been successful.
However, we have talked to the deputy mayor of
Education and she was very firm that she cannot
make a commitment. And she has also spoken to
the mayor and the mayor has said she's not
willing to make a commitment at this particular
time.

And it's too late in the budget cycle.

At this stage, if you know how D.C. works and
their budget process works, the mayor is going to
pretty much stay consistent of what -- where she
is. And you look at historic -- you guys have
done that. It's not going to magically appear in
this particular budget. Maybe if we're
successful for 2017, it's a thought, but let me
tell you based on history, and based upon some of
the information that we got in our meeting, I'm
not quite sure that the mayor is ready to rush to
assume our obligation in the form of assignment
or lease. We're not quite sure.

CHAIR CRIDER: Jim.

MR. DYKE: As I think all of you know,
this has been a troubling issue for me. And I,
on the one hand, am fully understanding the
fiscal responsibility we have. We can't let
money go out the door. You've got to step up and
deal with it. I guess my concern is is how do we
do that.

So I had two things in mind that I
thought we ought to do and the first one is to --
it's a proposed amendment to the resolution.
After your first whereas, because you were
talking about there's some concern about bluffing
and all those other things. I think what's been
lost here is that -- let me just read the
proposal and I think that will be self-
explanatory.

"Whereas, the University of the District of Columbia Board of Trustees remains fully committed to development of a comprehensive community college with hubs located throughout the District that address our academic mission and are fiscally feasible." Which in the resolution makes it clear. So for anybody who wants to read its action if, in fact, it's taken, as stepping back from the community college, I think we need to make it clear that that is not the case. I think that's what Joe has said. And I think that's how you feel. And I think it's important that we make that part of what ever fiscal action we have to take.

The second has to do with the timing.

MR. ASKEW: Can you say that one more time? Whereas --

MR. DYKE: It would right after the second one, before you start -- where you talk about March 2010, you start talking about 801 there. It would be after the first whereas. It
would be "Whereas, the University of the District of Columbia Board of Trustees remains fully committed to development of a comprehensive community college with hubs located throughout the District that address our academic mission and are fiscally feasible."

Now that is a general statement of our support for the community college, locations beyond Van Ness, whatever is there. And we've had some discussion about destination of hubs, things of that nature. It's not getting into that other than to say whatever we're doing is to be consistent with our academic mission. And the fiscally feasible part means we have to be able to afford it. In other words, there's money there to support that. And I think it's important that we send that signal. And I would hope that the maker of the motion would be amenable to accepting that as a friendly amendment, just to send a clear signal.

MR. ASKEW: Let me just say when we looked at this to be quite frank with you, it
just happens to be that a community college is in this building, right? 801 North Capitol Street.

Had there been bachelor degree programs or graduate degree programs, we would have had to make the same tough decision because at the end of the day we were focused more so on the cost associated with being there in a building.

If there is a thought that -- I mean I'm not quite sure that I get that there is a feeling that we're backing away from the community college and having a presence as a hub in the District of Columbia. And again, maybe that is true that people are feeling that way.

So in my mind, I guess if -- I just don't want to lock us into -- I think we all want to be a hub. I don't want to just to be for the community college to be quite frankly. If we could get bachelors' programs in places where we are not now graduate programs to make things more accessible, I'm down for that, too.

CHAIR CRIDER: Let me just say, I think -- Jerome, you wanted to say something.
You can go ahead and then I'll --

MR. SHELTON: Again, for the information of the Board, I think this is appropriate. The hub concept has been fully endorsed by the CEO of the community college as a new concept which we have not had a chance to discuss. I don't think knee-jerk nobody disagrees from the university to the community college. But I think putting it in this particular effort makes a commitment that we're not sure we'll be able to follow up on as we move to the decision about 801.

I think 801 requires us to make a specific call about 801 and we need to investigate the costing of the idea so that we can determine whether or not we should go forward or retreat. But right now, the full costing impact is what we owe. And we need to know what we owe, how we can make it work for us to best benefit the whole system. And that's the issue, not any future design models that we're interested in, not any things that we fully
believe are right, but the decision is about 801 and the cost of moving it, dealing with it and paying for it so that we can support the students at the whole university.

CHAIR CRIDER: Let me just say,
though, I'm sorry, Jim, do you want to?
I just want to say a couple of things because I personally don't have issues with this language, this provision. Why? Because one, we already have hubs. Whether we call it a hub or not, we already have hubs. We're at P.R. Harris. We're at Bertie Backus. We're at the airport hangar. We are at Shadd and moving across the street from Shadd or somewhere. So technically, we already have hubs.

I don't know whether we want to -- if you think about it, people are going to perceive this as us backing away from the community college. That's been the fear all along. Every time we have raised this issue of moving out of 801, this isn't the first time we've talked about moving out of 801. Remember, Vince Gray standing
up in a meeting say "over his dead body" and I
told him I'll walk over it then. You know? That
was his position, would we move out of 801.

I understand David Grosso has said the
same thing, over their dead body will we move out
of 801 because they perceive it as backing away
from the college.

If this sends a message that we're not
backing away from the community college, that we
believe in the community college and we will stay
committed to what we have with the community
college and only expand into other locations if
it is needed and if we have money to fund it, I'm
good with this. But if there's something in this
-- I'm not the lawyer here, so now I'm talking
between these two lawyers. I'm called a lawyer
sometimes, but you know, if there is something in
that language -- I'm not a lawyer yet, I'm
working on it. But if there's something in that
language that makes you feel that this is saying
more than the way I'm reading it, I want to
understand that, because I'm reading it very
simple that we will continue to have that
community college and that we would commit to
having it in the communities, as long as we have
money to pay for it.

MR. DYKE: That's the specific intent
that I had when I put it forth. You hit it right
on the head.

MR. ASKEW: So again, and I appreciate
that, Madam Chair, your insight on that. I guess
I'm looking at it from a university-wide
standpoint. And I'm looking at it that there may
be some programs that we may want to offer that
are part of the hub. I don't think the hub is
not visionary to me because that is what we do
already. I mean some people are saying it's just
not -- because we're already doing it. I mean
that's a visionary or something that really in my
mind we're not doing that's going to create and
help us grow and prosper.

I don't want us to get locked down
into -- because right now, we do have a hub, but
we also know there are at least, there's P.R.
Harris right now and to be quite frank with you, it's part of the hub, that we need to make some more tough decisions on and I'll leave the next Operations person to deal with that.

MR. ASKEW: This amendment would not preclude that.

MR. DYKE: Okay, right. Okay, well, I mean again, I just want to be clear because when we say a hub, that doesn't necessarily mean that we're -- again, I don't want to mean that we're in every ward because we don't necessarily have the finances to do that.

So Madam Chair, I do understand what Trustee Shelton was saying as well. Again, we really were focused on 801 North Capitol Street. We weren't really trying to back away from community college offerings at all. That's not what this is about.

It is true, you're right, you reminded me that there are people who think we are walking away and even in my intro statement I said what I said because I want to make sure people from the
community college don't think that this is an effort to back away from our ongoing support and my personal advocacy for leadership and structure changes at the community college.

CHAIR CRIDER: Gabby, can you mute, please, mute your line.

MR. ASKEW: So having said that, you know, I will accept the language as a friendly amendment, as long as there are no objections.

MR. DYKE: She's thank you for that.

CHAIR CRIDER: Trustee Wyner.

MR. WYNER: So for me, I guess, I'm a little bit concerned that when I look at the numbers, it's entirely possible we see $3 million in savings and $4 or $5 or $6 million in costs over the next few years. So we're losing facilities money. I know that there may be long-term savings. And I absolutely am interested in the efficiency of the institution and making sure that we're not spending money where money is ill spent. I mean we have to make choices.

I am concerned that with a lack of
certainty, recognizing that in our current
circumstances, that we've been given good
information, given where we are in the process.
So I just wanted to be real clear about that. I
think given where we are in the process we
couldn't get there. And I appreciate the candor
on that. That's the best we've got for now. But
I think given the information we have, I'm not
sure that I'm comfortable that we would be
fulfilling our fiduciary responsibility to make
this vote now just on the fiscal side, let alone
on the academic side. And when the options are
if we leave 801 and move here, those are the
options we've been presented and I recognize I'm
not part of the -- I haven't been at the
Facilities Committee meeting. I may have been
available, I could have come.

But the information gaps that I'm
seeing here, can certainly feel to me like we're
not quite ready for that. What worries me is we
make a vote here today to make this change and
then we get more information on subleasing. We
get more information on the costs and the equation doesn't look quite as favorable and is presented in this resolution. And I would -- I am just not really comfortable making this vote today given what we know today and I do think that a decision of this magnitude where we are, this is a new institution, the community college, new in the sense that we tried to create it as something connected to, but now different in some ways from the other elements of UDC or as part of.

And I think this kind of relocation can have a significant impact. And I'm not sure that I'm comfortable with the full range of what we know either on the fiscal side or on the academic side for us to be making this decision. I understand we'll have a second chance to approve Backus, but we're deciding today to relocate and I don't see us undoing that once that's done.

CHAIR CRIDER: If there was new information presented, one of the things that we
said before is that if the city were to step up
which I don't believe they will, I hope they do,
but you know, so far, we haven't had any success
in getting them to say we will, in fact, increase
your budget by $5 to $8 million to cover the cost
of these facilities for the community college.
We have been at this for five years and they have
not stepped up. We're into the second mayor now.
And --

MS. LEMUS: They're not going to step
up.

CHAIR CRIDER: Right, thank you,
Gabby. So that's why we haven't seen then a
willingness to do that. We're going through the
motion. We keep asking and asking and in the
meantime our budgets keep getting cut, you know.
We don't get the money that we need to support
our operations. I mean Jim made a very
impassioned comment about the impact of reducing
our budget in a year where we're expecting an
accreditation visit. I don't know that that fell
on fertile ground. But I am concerned -- and let
me ask a different question of you. What does it
take to make you comfortable? Because what we
know is that we're continuing to pay this money
every year and that we don't have the budget to
support this on an ongoing basis every year.

We needed to empower them to be able
to go out and answer some of the questions that
you're looking for. So without this action they
can't go out and begin to talk about who they can
sublet to and have some earnest conversations
with the landlord because they're not empowered
to do that unless we have some action here.

So if there's something specific that
you want that would help crystallize a decision,
you know, I think we're willing to hear that. I
see your uneasiness. I am not trying to be flip
or anything about that.

MR. WYNER: And I appreciate the
question. I think for me the $12 to $17 and
being a little more advanced in terms of
understanding what the real constructions are
going to be, that would be helpful. I think
understanding the components of the operations that, in fact would be saved as a result of this move and what wouldn't because that's a big delta. That $2 million, right? We don't really know that.

CHAIR CRIDER: But we do know that something here would be less than $2 million. We do know that.

MR. WYNER: Right, but is it $100,000 less or is it $1.9 million less or somewhere in between? I understand we haven't gotten there yet.

CHAIR CRIDER: Right. But we know it's something less than $2 million.

MR. WYNER: Significantly less.

CHAIR CRIDER: Right. It's something less than $2 million.

MR. WYNER: But I'd like to see what that savings is. And then the flip side of it is some conversation, because everything is tradeoffs, right? It's all about tradeoffs.

And the academic side of this, I'm not
hearing a lot of conversation. What I'm hearing is we could build classrooms here. I believe that. We don't know what the costs will be. But on the academic side in terms of whether this is the right location for those programs, I don't know the answer to that.

And so I would want more information on that side, understanding what the potential downside would be for a move and what the upside might be.

You know, Dr. Crider, Chairperson Crider, I am comfortable -- I'm open minded on this. I do want to learn the information, but I feel as though we're making a vote to make a move with a lot of uncertainty here and what concerns me most is that the conversation has been importantly we've got fiscal considerations and facilities considerations, but what I'm not hearing is the academic students' success questions and what the impact might be.

CHAIR CRIDER: But have we had greater, any more or less -- I mean I believe
that the greatest growth and I may be wrong, but
I think the greatest growth in terms of numbers
of students at the community college has actually
come from Workforce Development. I believe that
to be more a function of that team over there
that is very zealous about bringing people in to
workforce development programs. I think they
deserve kudos for how they have grown that
program.

(Applause.)

But the academic in terms of the
associate degree programs, I don't know that they
have grown any more than what they were when they
were here. So the move there or the move here, I
don't know that it's had an impact on that at
all.

MR. WYNER: Fair enough.

CHAIR CRIDER: And they weren't here
before, you know.

MR. WYNER: Right, so the workforce
programs. We want to know what is the impact of
moving all of the workforce programs?
CHAIR CRIDER: Many of those -- let me ask the question though because P.R. Harris is not at 801. Many of the workforce folks are at P.R. Harris, at Shadd, at the airport hangar, and at Bertie Backus. Am I correct?

MR. WYNER: Are there only associate degree programs at 801?

CHAIR CRIDER: I don't know if it's only associate degree programs, but I'm telling you, you've got these folks looking at me in the audience, they know what their numbers are, right? So are the majority of -- somebody from the community college can get up the mic, are the majority of the workforce programs out in the communities and when I say communities, I mean P.R. Harris, Shadd, Bertie Backus and the airport hangar, and St. E's and United Medical Center.

Or are they at 801?

PARTICIPANT: They're not at 801.

CHAIR CRIDER: Exactly. So it would have minimal impact or where the growth at the community college has been which has been in the
Workforce Development Program.

Yes, Jim.

MR. DYKE: I understand the uneasiness. I also understand the fact that we've got to take some action, but what I think I'm hearing and I had chatted with you about one process we might follow to bring it back to the Board, but it sounds to me like if we would agree here that we would get an update maybe at our July meeting as to what has happened in the interim as far as getting answers to some of these questions and also to see whether or not the Council has taken any action and then hopefully in that time period we also will be announcing a selection of a new president. And it may well be that there could be some who knows, good will that people would want to say well, maybe we ought to do something to give this particular person an opportunity to get off to a good start. And maybe that might be a way of addressing these concerns that would come back and take a hard look at it and see what has
transpired in the interim, including checking out
the negotiations with the landlord into that
nature.

CHAIR CRIDER: And there are two other
caveats that we've always said and I don't know
that anybody here is advocating backing away from
that. What we said from the beginning when we
had these discussions is one, if it threatened
our accreditation, we wouldn't do it. And if the
city steps up and helps us out on this issue, we
wouldn't have to do it. And so if those two
things were to happen then I think that the
resolution gets revisited and I don't know -- you
vote a resolution in, but here I go again trying
to step into territory that's not mine, but I
assume that if you decide that -- that this
resolution is no longer relevant to what you need
to do that there's a process where you vote
something else in. You take this back. And so
to the extent that I think we do have some
caveats that we've always said that we would
honor, the independent accreditation and if the
city gives us money, then that is protection that we don't -- we're not going to move about this foolishly.

MR. DYKE: I'm in agreement with those two caveats and I've added the third one now which is getting as much information as we can to some of these unanswered questions.

CHAIR CRIDER: Right.

MR. DYKE: And get an update on that in July.

CHAIR CRIDER: Absolutely.

MR. DYKE: Once again, I'm the optimist as far as whether or not the city is going to be responding to us.

MR. ASKEW: Madam Chair, let me just -- so that's what the Operations Committee is tasked to do. The updates are what we're going to go through today. I mean that's nothing different. So I'm okay with that. As long as we understand that that's nothing different than had I continued to be the Operations chair, I would have done the exact same thing. Erik's got to go
out and find somebody who is an expert in this
stuff who as we go along, he's going to give more
data to Josh. That's absolutely the way the
process works, right?

And if the numbers are way off, the
Board has an opportunity to redirect. But I do
believe we can't -- we are the Board. We've got
to make some decisions here. You can sit here
and not make these decisions and again, we are
hopefully, we will have a new president.

I remember talking to our acting
president and he said to us that I need the Board
to make a decision so that he can determine how
best to work with us and set his priorities and
his vision. I think we've got to do this -- I
want to take this, I want to help, you know, so
where he can concentrate and we can say this is
the direction we're going to go. Like any other
thing, the committee will come out. It will
report it. If that's what you want, that's what
you ask for. And that's what you will get.

The reason you have all this data,
believe me, I mean, Erik, Mr. Rogers, I'm sure
Barbara Jumper, the CFO, I mean they have spent a
tremendous amount of effort to get us to this
point so we can answer, so that we can respond in
a way that we've been responding today. So we've
listened to you throughout this process. And
again, willing to accept your original
recommendations.

I know again, the chairman is thorough
and I know she's going to give direction to the
new Operations Committee and you will get the
information that you want. As I said before, I
mean, we're going to have every detail today.
And my experience as an institution, this
institution just doesn't work like that. My
experience in corporate America and dealing with
these types of things, it doesn't always work
like this. There's always these things that are
uncertain or may be unknown, but we manage
through those and I think that this Board is well
equipped, well equipped, to work their way
through those as we have other issues here at the
institution.

CHAIR CRIDER: Absolutely. And I think that the language, Jim, your friendly amendment. I do think that it's important that it's in here because it does reflect that ongoing commitment to the community college. We need to make sure that people understand that, that that's out there, and I do believe that that gives this some additional stuff that it needs here.

I understand the discomfort over here, but we need to empower these guys to be able to get answers for us and we can't do it unless we have some plans to do something.

Mr. Thompson.

MR. THOMPSON: If I could just make sure I would capture the friendly amendment appropriately. "Whereas, the University of the District of Columbia Board of Trustees remains fully committed to developing a comprehensive community college with hubs located throughout the District that address our academic mission..."
and are fiscally feasible."

CHAIR CRIDER: And I think --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. ASKEW: How are you going to interpret that?

MR. DYKE: They can be located in the District.

MR. ASKEW: Does that mean in every ward?

MR. DYKE: I wouldn't say in every ward. They're throughout the District now. I'm not sure I understood --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

CHAIR CRIDER: I think it's okay.

MR. DYKE: I'll let you know.

VICE CHAIR BELL: Was there a second one that you were going to make, a second modification?

MR. DYKE: As I mentioned to the chair, I was thinking of something to deal with the timing question, but I think the way we discussed it --
VICE CHAIR BELL: Okay, I just wanted to be sure.

MR. WYNER: I just -- in decisions that I've made in the corporate world and in the nonprofit world, I would have better information than this. And given the lack of information we've gotten at times when we've asked for it, and the slow pace at which information comes to us on some other issues, this is good information for where we are, but I am not confident that we have the information we need today to make this decision. And so I would recommend that we postpone this decision given that. I'm not sure given the fact that we will not see any cost savings for three years as far as minimum, why the difference between now and July makes a difference. And I do think that Trustee Dyke makes a good case that a new president will be coming in and there's an opportunity for the mayor to potentially respond to this idea. And I understand that I haven't been part of those conversations.
I think this is a significant decision and I don't think this is easy to just undo it when we discover other fiscal information. I think making this decision will have ramifications in terms of the expectations of lots of folks in terms of what's going to happen. And to make that kind of decision to me should be based, for me, on more significant information. I'm coming late to the party. I've been here a year. But I'm not comfortable that we have the information that we need today. And I have to say that in other contexts, I've gotten better information for something this significant, prior to making a decision. I'm not saying we should have it here today, but I am saying we should have it prior to making a decision.

CHAIR CRIDER: I appreciate that. On the other hand, you know, again, I think those of us that have been dealing with this for a much longer period of time have a different perspective and that's what makes us all unique and contributing members of the board, these
different perspectives.

I just think that we have to take some action and you know, maybe I'm being naive or Pollyannaish now to believe that if, in fact, we find out additional information that is not favorable that we can undo this. I do believe that. I think folks sitting around this table would hold us to that. But right now, this is the information that we have to get more information. I'm going to ask Board members to step up and to give us what information you want them to get that makes us feel more comfortable as we get to the next decision or point that we have to do something so that they know specifically what we want from them.

I think sometimes the Board is at fault and that we are not always clear and are not always giving them good direction in terms of what we're looking for. Let's not do that this time by giving them very specific, very clear information about the data or the information that we need to have them bring back to us that
gives us more comfort with moving this decision forward. But we're going to vote on this resolution today. I'm just saying that.

MR. DYKE: I call for the question, Madam Chair.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes?

MS. BENNETT: Thank you, Madam Chair. I think through all this discussion we talked a lot about and I'm going to go back to Trustee -- Josh's point about the students' portion of this. One of the impacts on the students moving from 801 back to here, I was here when they were here, so I know full well. But were the students consulted after we had spoken to the committee and we were sure that we wanted to submit this to the Board from February? Were students at any point as to the move and how they felt about it? Would it be accessible for them to get to class and everything like that here? I just wanted to find out if that was ever done.

MS. PETTY: A survey was developed and it's out now. It hasn't closed yet, I
understand. But the survey was developed.

Survey questions are very specific. They ask
students the impact on their continued attendance
on moving and asked a lot of questions about the
pluses and minuses, not just do you want to move
or don't you want to move? There was a survey, I
understand from the community college and has not
been closed. We also have it open on this campus
to see potential impact here.

MS. BENNETT: Okay.

MR. WYNER: Can I just ask why the
survey, is there a concern about what students
may feel about this move? Presumably, the survey
was done for a reason and if we don't have the
results that might suggest something.

MS. PHILLIPS: I'm Dianna Phillips,
the chief executive Officer of the community
college, Yes, we did develop a survey. It is
out. We looked at -- we didn't look at the data.
We've got 176 responses to date. Yes, we are
concerned about the impact on the students which
is why we determined to conduct the survey in the
first place. It took us a little while. We distributed it through Urban Monkey. We actually moved it forward a pace so that students can actually vote using their smart phones. So we're hoping the final results will be in the end of next week. I'm looking at Dean Hamilton and Dean Ford, because we distributed it throughout the community college.

I do want to make one statement about enrollment. I need to clarify a little bit about enrollment at the community college between workforce development and the academic side of the house. So the community college has been in operation since the fall of 2009. My understanding is yes, there has been ebbs and flows on the credit side and the noncredit side with enrollment. My current understanding and I wasn't here in 2009 was that we started -- the community college started with about 1700 credit students and about 900 noncredit students. I think that's the right ballpark figure. Right now, today, we have about 1700 noncredit students
and we have about 2500 credit students.

CHAIR CRIDER: Right, and at one point you had 2700 credit students.

MS. PHILLIPS: Correct. To be brutally honest with you, part of our enrollment challenges at the community college is that students have to come here to register at the community college. So we are not in complete control everyone in management. So there are some barriers for that perspective.

We do not have -- we do have noncredit programs in all the locations that you mentioned except the hangar. The hangar is aviation maintenance and it's only a credit program.

About 95 percent of our enrollment on the credit side of the house is at 801 North Capitol Street. We've got students out at the hangar and we've got credit students at Backus. We also offer some classes sporadically at some of the other sites. It depends on what kinds of enrollment that we can encourage there.

One of the reasons that the model came
forward for the destination campuses to be very honest with you is that we are modeling -- we looked at the success that we were having on the noncredit side of the house. A lot of that success is also tied to the fact that noncredit programs are at no cost to enrollees and the noncredit side of the house has a lot less restrictions on the things that we can do. For example, we can pick up and take a team of folks to P.R. Harris and register people for a week if we want to on the noncredit side. We cannot do that on the credit side of the house.

The other thing that we provided to the Board and to the Community College Committee was a breakdown of enrollment at the community college and the flagship and the law school by ward for the fall 2014 semester. And there are significant differences if you look at enrollment. Across the institution, across the system, each component of the system has a different population demographic. And we pull from different areas and that information was
made available as well. Thank you.

CHAIR CRIDER: Any further questions or discussion?

MR. ASKEW: Call for the question, Madam Chair.

CHAIR CRIDER: All in favor of approving the resolution to recommend the relocation of community college from 801 North Capitol to Building 41 at Van Ness, vote aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIR CRIDER: Opposed.

(Chorus of nays.)

CHAIR CRIDER: We've got two nays. Abstentions? One abstention. That motion carries. Thank you for that.

MR. SHELTON: Madam Chair, to my fellow trustees, for the first two years of my tenure here, we have what could be considered a stable budget. For the next three years, we had continuous runs on our budget from the plan that we just finished, the money for specific items without any increases in budget. We were
involved with 801 as a budget cost with promises of support.

We have received no support for the last three years and we now have another assault on our budget. And these budget assaults threaten the whole university and have been a special fear for the alumni of the institution, that the opportunity to go to college was very important to us and the university filled that gap. The community college gives the least of us an opportunity to get into the process, so we endorse it. But no alumni from the areas that I'm familiar with is interested in losing the university because of under funding. Let me finish.

The District of Columbia Public Schools follow the same model that has been used on the university. Under funding and then challenging the problems that occur because of under funding. We have been under funded consistently for the last three years with a major under funding when we go before the Middle
States people. When they challenge our accreditation, the whole city is going to suffer. And they seem to not understand Middle States and the gentleman from the consortium tried to make it clear. If you do nothing else, you give them money the year they show up. You don't take away money. That says you don't believe in the institution.

Our mayor publicly told us the story. But when it came down to dollars and cents, she again assaulted the budget of the university. And if you watch our history and I wish I were a better history student, you would see that these assaults have consistently denigrated the professionals and the people trying to provide a quality education to the most needy people that apply. If they can get in here, one of our gifts is we'll try to get you through to the end. We lost some of that because we lost some people. But we have people committed, but we need the financial resources and although you say you're not up to speed, understand when you take the
budget, you cripple the institution. And all the
buildings, the different programs that we've had
to pay for it. And they were mandated by our
biggest contributor.

MS. BENNETT: Madam Chair, if I may
make a brief comment?

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay, but then I want
to move on because we have a long agenda left and
I think we had a healthy discussion that we
needed to have, so make your statement and then
we're moving on.

MS. BENNETT: I want to say from a
student perspective that I do support a move
because I understand the budget hole that we're
in. I abstained because of the fact that I don't
have the survey of the students in front of me
and what they think about the move and that's
critical for my vote. Thank you.

CHAIR CRIDER: At the end of the day,
everybody needs to vote their own conscience.
And so you don't have to explain why you
abstained or why you voted no. You vote what you
believe is the right thing to do. I think that's what we've always tried to do here. So don't feel that you need to do that. Just you voted. I'm comfortable with everybody's vote. Because you voted what you believed. I have much more respect when you do that, so don't ever feel like you need to do that.

MR. ASKEW: Madam Chair --
CHAIR CRIDER: And then we're moving on.

MR. ASKEW: This won't take but a minute. I just --

MR. ASKEW: Just a second. You're signing off? Okay.

MR. ASKEW: All I want to do is just reemphasize that I know we don't have the student survey, but I will have to emphasize that we started this process with Vision 20-20 that my committee started in December of 2014. So from December 2014 to what's the date today? A voting day, April 28th, so --

VICE CHAIR BELL: Point of
clarification, this was in right sizing.

MR. ASKEW: Absolutely. So I mean I know we don't have the survey and maybe there's to a point again, we could have had it. There's plenty of times to have that done and ready for today, just to have it. It just didn't happen.

CHAIR CRIDER: Thank you all. I'm going to move on. We have three people that have requested to testify. They have two minutes. And I want somebody to keep time strictly because we've got to get through this whole agenda.

The first Mr. Bardin.

MR. BARDIN: Thank you, Chair Crider. Committee Chair Askew, I didn't catch what you said about me, but everybody thought it was funny, so I think so, too. And Chairperson Dyke and all the rest of you, thank you for letting me talk. I was told I should confine myself to items on the agenda. So there are other things I would love to talk to you about, but I will not.

You have coming up the election of officers to take office March 15. And I have
some respectful suggestions for them,
particularly your chairperson and your treasurer,
which I think will make you more effective in the
move you've been making, certainly over the last
year, but really over several years toward
stronger governance and more effective governance
by the Board and I think in your relations, what
we call city hall or Wilson Building.

Here are my suggestions for you. One
is to ask the D.C. Chief Financial Officer, Mr.
DeWitt, to meet with the full Board to discuss
how he and you can best carry out your respective
duties for governing the university. This is, in
fact, governance shared between the Board of
Trustees which originally was the only governor
and the D.C. CFOs since Congress created that
post, he is a partner, but he doesn't meet with
you.

Number two, invite CFO DeWitt to meet
with your Audit, Budget, and Finance Committee
for open discussion of the outside auditors' Yellow Book report dated February 3, 2015 which
KPMG addressed to this Board of Trustees and I want to let you know that at the CFO's budget hearing last week, Mr. DeWitt said that he has entered into an agreement with the City Administrator and the Inspector General on a joint process to follow up on all the Yellow Books, including this —

CHAIR CRIDER: Twenty seconds.

MR. BARDIN: -- special UDC Yellow Book. And I suggest you seek out and implement the best practices as to the Board's interaction with both the outside auditor and the internal auditor including what's public and nonpublic.

Now I was going to talk about 801. I hope you have it. You just voted on 801. I have to get a hold of your resolution. I don't know if you realize, but you've spent an hour and 20 minutes talking about a resolution which is in front of you, but none of us has it —

CHAIR CRIDER: Your time is actually up, Mr. Bardin. We thank you for your testimony.

MR. BARDIN: Thank you for your
attention and for your service to the university
and the people of the District of Columbia as a
whole.

CHAIR CRIDER: Thank you. The next
person to testify is Mr. Vanlal. And just for
the record, all of these testimony will be a part
of the written record.

MR. VANLAL: Thank you, Trustees,
Members. I'm Vanlal. I'm the Secretary of the
Student Government Association of the community
college. Years ago, the UDC Trustees made a
disastrous mistake in the selection of UDC's
president. They did not select a successful
leader who understands the District of Columbia
and cares about D.C. students. Instead, the
Trustees inexplicably chose a controversial
failure, Dr. Sessoms, who had reportedly been
removed from City University of New York by
Trustees, admits allegations of misuse of funds.
Sessoms proved to be an unmitigated disaster at
UDC and had to be removed by the UDC Trustees
amidst allegations of misuse of funds.
Why were the Trustees surprised to see

history repeat itself so perfectly? After all,

what students and the faculty could see that

Sessoms was a disaster before he was hired? The

UDC Faculty Senate and the UDC Student Government

unanimously opposed Sessoms. Virtually, the

etire student body and the faculty stood united

in vigorous opposition, but our advice was

ignored, our recommendations were rebuffed and

our dissent was disrespected.

Are the UDC Trustees about to make a

similar mistake again? We at the community

college are disturbed by the rumor that the most

qualified candidate for the UDC president, UDC

honorary holding degree, Dr. Malveaux, has been

removed from consideration. We are doubly

concerned that Trustee Lyon appears to favor of

his fraternity associates, Dr. Mason, a non-DC

resident. Like Sessoms, Mason has lost the trust

of his faculty who recommended he be fired.

Mason lost unanimous vote of no confidence amidst

allegations of mismanagement of funds.
Why do UDC Trustees favor controversial failures from the cities instead of backing someone as successful as Dr. Malveaux who has a long history with D.C. Dr. Malveaux, by contrast, was successful at Bennett College which grew under her leadership and she was called by Dr. West as the most public intellectual person in the country.

Will the Trustees let us have a great UDC leader or will they import another controversial failure. Thank you very much.

CHAIR CRIDER: Thank you for your testimony.

And then last person to give testimony is Dr. Khatri.

DR. KHATRI: Good evening, Trustees.

And thank you for providing me the opportunity to testify and I'm so glad the Board of Trustees changed their mind and allowed us to testify this time.

My testimony is in three -- I'm Dr. Daryao Khatri, Professor of Physics. And my
testimony is in three parts, an opportunity of decades, Vision 20–20, maybe I should call it Delusion 20–20, and membership of a faculty member on the Board of Trustees.

For the first time in a long while the Faculty Senate has unanimously endorsed a presidential candidate, Dr. Malveaux for the president of the university. The UDC Board of Trustees should act on this endorsement favorably. In that way, we can move on to handle the serious business of the university in terms of budget, shared governance, and accreditation. This has not happened in decades. The faculty organization unanimously endorsed the candidacy of a single presidential candidate. The Board should consider taking the opportunity, take the high road and forget about petty politics.

Vision 20–20 should be labeled as Delusion 20–20, in my opinion. By now you know, the student enrollment of the university is down for the fall semester 2014 and 2015 by 3.5 percent in both semesters. If we are to meet the
goal of achieving protected student enrollment of
5,737 students for the fall semester of 2015, we
need to increase the current enrollment by 11.4
percent.

I'll repeat myself, is it achievable?
Not really, if I may answer this question myself.
The Board should consider especially hiding the
Vision 20-20 in a box and never look at it again.
In this context I will say in student enrollment
projections, the Middle States noted in 2011 and
somebody should take a serious note of that, the
leaders recommend that UDC develop a realistic
enrollment projection model based on past
performance, rather than hope.

CHAIR CRIDER: That's time, Dr.

Khatri.

DR. KHATRI: I'll finish my last area.
And the last one is I will ask the Board to
support the recommendation of the Faculty Senate
and request the City Council to appoint a faculty
member as a Board member. Thank you very much.

CHAIR CRIDER: Thank you. The next
item on the agenda is the election of officers

    MR. ASKEW: Madam Chair, I'd like to
nominate Dr. Elaine Crider to serve in this
position for yet another year.

    MR. TARDD: Second.

    MR. SHELTON: I suggest the
nominations be closed.

    MR. ASKEW: Well, let me just say this
because this will be my last opportunity to
participate in such an important vote. Dr.
Crider, I think has won the heart, in respect,
probably most importantly than I would assume all
the members of the Board. She has been driven to
make sure that we are making decisions based upon
the information. She has consulted us as a
Board. She has consulted us individually. She
carries herself and is really a true member of
the Firebird University of the District of
Columbia family. I have not met another alumni
in my tenure who is dedicated to this institution
than Dr. Crider.
I could not also think of a better chair of the Board to help us transition whoever our next leader will be at this institution. I think that she will not only be respectful and a number one supporter of whoever the president is, but I also think she will be an ear and a supporter to the university stakeholders as a whole. I think a number of you in this room have worked with her and again, our job, our role as Board members coming in from the outside is really to give you a perspective of what we believe, based upon the market and based upon our experiences that will help make this place a better place. I don't think anybody -- there are folks here that think that the next president is going to get away without being accountable. With her leadership, her vocal leadership, I just don't see -- I can't see a better person if she is willing to serve in this capacity. She has served in this capacity, she's served for two years now and I think is able to carry a message that I don't think has been carried as
effectively in the past.

So with that and again, I know this is hopefully a foregone conclusion, but I did want to at least take this very last opportunity to say you are certainly the number one person on my list to continue to lead this Board. And I hope that if she is -- if the decision is made to make her the chair, that everybody in this room, that the Board members will lend their full support in making her and making this institution a success.

Thank you. Call for the question.

CHAIR CRIDER: Am I supposed to do this? All this in favor -- Vice Chair?

VICE CHAIR BELL: So we will now have a vote on whether or not Dr. Elaine A. Crider shall remain as chair of the UDC Board of Trustees. All those in favor, please say --

MR. ASKEW: Are there any other nominations?

VICE CHAIR BELL: We're not going to ask for that. All those in favor -- do you accept the nomination for formality's sake?
CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

VICE CHAIR BELL: Okay, good. Now you can't say why did I do this. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

VICE CHAIR BELL: Those opposed? Any abstentions? It is the opinion of the Vice Chair, that the motion passes. Congratulations.

CHAIR CRIDER: Thank you.

(Applause.)

I'm just going to say one thing. Thank you all on the Board for again your confidence and you know, you guys work a system for real. The job is hard, but because I have your support, it does make it a lot easier to bear.

I can't say no to Joe and I'm going to tell you why. I meant to say this earlier, but Joe came to me about nine months ago and Joe said, Elaine -- in fact, Joe called me and wanted to have lunch with me. And in fact, it was this time last year, this time last year. I thought
Joe was calling me because he was going to strengthen my arm to be chair again. So I'm preparing my stuff to combat Joe to say no, I'm not doing that again. And Joe shocked me because that wasn't what he wanted. What Joe wanted was to tell me that he was tired and that he had worked a long time on this Board and he was ready to step down.

I think I said I don't believe that or some kind of way, I just wasn't ready to accept that. And so when I left Joe, I tried to think of a way that I could get him to stay. So I'm going to trick Joe because I've got to have -- he has got to stay. So I was able to come up -- I asked Joe, well, could you do this for me? And I know you want to go, but can you agree to stay and do this? And Joe agreed to stay and do this. And then one day he told me he said, you know, you're kind of slick because before I know it, you've got me staying the whole year.

So that's why I can't say no to Joe. I owe him big time because I kept him here and I think we're all the better for it. And I thank
you guys again for your trust.

I would like to keep my officers if they are amenable to that. Reggie is not here. But I'll ask him. Chris, if you're willing. You don't have a say because you forced me, so you don't get a say. Gabbie, are you willing to stay as the secretary? Did she leave? Okay, I'll check with them, but I'd like to keep the slate that I have.

Take a vote and stick them with it, is that what you said?

So can we vote on the slate then, provisionally, upon their acceptance.

Mr. Shelton: Second.

Chair Crider: Moved and seconded.

All in favor vote aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Any opposed or abstentions? That carries as well.

Okay, thank you all again. We now -- I'd like to go into executive session. I needed to push the executive appointments back because
there's one issue that we need to deal with in executive session for these four executive appointments.

Yes, Mr. President?

PRESIDENT LYONS: Madam Chair, before you go into executive session, I'd like to ask are the students still here who authored this -- this is a teachable moment. The students are still here? Well, may I educate?

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Because this is a teachable moment. You have student leadership which I respect has submitted a statement and I want to just correct, students, so that you'll know and you can return and spread the word appropriately. First of all, James E. Lyons has never chaired this Board, okay? And you have a statement in here, "instead, the Trustees, under the chairmanship of James E. Lyons" -- just a minute, let me finish. You made a presentation, now let me finish, please, because this is what is on the record.
And secondly, I'm very happy and can say under oath that I had no idea that Dr. Mason was a fraternity brother of mine. And I look forward, if we go to court, I can testify under oath that I had no idea about that. So I don't know who feeds you information, but I would hope that they would feed you correct information if you're going to come before this distinguished body and make statements. Thank you very much.

CHAIR CRIDER: Thank you, Dr. Lyons.

I'll make one other statement for the record. Dr. Lyons was not on the Search Committee. And so he had no vote in any of the three candidates that stood up to be the three finalists. So whoever again gave information that would show Dr. Lyons favoring any other candidates has the information wrong. He wasn't on the committee.

MR. WYNER: I would also like to add that in my conversations with Dr. Lyons throughout the presidential search process, he has never once -- and he's been really very clear, never once endorsed any candidate, nor
actually made comments on any candidates to me as a member and I do think that it's important that we had a couple of disagreements here today, that we agree to discuss the facts and that we agree to -- that we may disagree. And I really do appreciate the opinions of those coming forward with regard to the leadership of the institution and any other issues. And we be careful not to insinuate by repeating rumors that are unsubstantiated.

MS. POINER: My name is Lisa Poiner. I'm a student at the community college. I am not a member of the SGA, but after speaking with my fellow classmates, it was also said to be rumored. We never said this was a concrete fact or anything and we stand by the leadership of the District of Columbia.

And another thing, from the student perspective, it would be very beneficial if the members, all members of the Board would come to the locations, the various locations and visit and become more comfortable with what's going on
and more in touch with the student population.

Thank you.

MR. WYNER: I accept the invitation.

Thank you.

CHAIR CRIDER: I do think though that we need to encourage our students and that they should be more engaged in what the process is here. So I want to commend them for stepping up and providing that.

(Applause.)

MR. SHELTON: The law school is waiting.

CHAIR CRIDER: But do it in a way that's appropriate and that your information is accurate. So thank you for that.

And let me just say one other thing as we get ready to go into executive committee because I heard when I said we were going into executive committee, I heard some rumors, not rumors, I heard some grumbling about what we were getting ready to do.

We are not announcing a presidential
selection tonight. You saw an update to the process that's on the agenda. You never saw that we were announcing anything. So for those of you that groaned about that, we are going into executive committee to deal with executive appointments that we have in front of us and it's our prerogative to go into executive committee when we need to. So we're going to recess to do that.

The Search Committee itself has worked hard. The Board is deliberating and we will, in fact, make a decision and when we make that decision you all will know about it. It has been transparent. It has been open. The deliberations that we're having now shall result in some pick of one of the two remaining candidates and again, we'll make you aware of that. Our deliberations are confidential and we will keep them confidential. But I think it's important for you all to know that this is the most important job that the Board of Trustees has to do and that is selecting a president. That's
our job. That's the only real job we have and we've taken that job on and that is selecting the president. Other than that, it is up to the president to run the university. It is our job to pick the president and we oversee the performance of the president. The president does everything else.

So I'm sorry for those of you that were disappointed that we don't have that announcement to make tonight, but we will be making that announcement soon enough and soon as we know, we'll let you know. Okay?

I would like to in accordance --

PARTICIPANT: Madam Chair, excuse me.

One of the two candidates?

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes, we did. And you need to learn -- excuse me, you need to learn order. Okay? You're out of order. Okay. So thank you.

Executive session. In accordance with -- oh, I need a roll call and a motion to go into executive session.
MR. SHELTON: Motion to go into executive session made, offered.

PARTICIPANT: Second.

CHAIR CRIDER: It's been moved and seconded. May we have a roll call vote please?

MS. FRANKLIN: Mr. Askew?

MR. ASKEW: Yes.

MS. FRANKLIN: Mr. Bell?

VICE CHAIR BELL: Yes.

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

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

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

MR. DYKE: Yes.

MS. FRANKLIN: Mr. Felton. Dr. Lemus.

Dr. Lemus.

MS. LEMUS: Yes.

MS. FRANKLIN: Dr. Lyons.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Yes.

MS. FRANKLIN: General Schwartz? Mr. Shelton.

MR. SHELTON: Yes.
MS. FRANKLIN: Dr. Tardd.

MR. TARD: Yes.

MS. FRANKLIN: Ms. Thompson.

MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

MS. FRANKLIN: Mr. Wyner.

MR. WYNER: Yes.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay, I've got to read this little statement real fast, right?

In accordance with Section 2-575.10 of the D.C. Code, the Board of Trustees hereby gives notice that it may conduct an executive session for the purpose of discussing the appointment, employment, assignment, promotion, performance evaluation, compensation, discipline, demotion, removal or resignation of government appointees, employees, or officials. And we'll now go into executive session.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 8:02 p.m. and resumed at 9:29 p.m.)

CHAIR CRIDER: So let's call the meeting back to order. And the Board held an
Executive Session and all things acted upon were proper.

We go back to the agenda and we have one additional action item that we needed to take and that was the four executive appointments.

So Trustee Askew, as the operations can I ask you to do that, those four resolutions for us? This will be your last duty as chair of the Operations Committee.

MR. ASKEW: So let's start off with, this is for the extension, the appointment of Ms. Marilyn Hamilton as the acting dean of Academic Affairs of the community college. This resolution is extending, there's a recommendation that she continue to serve as the acting dean for the Academic Affairs of the community college for the University of the District of Columbia, based on her knowledge, past performance, and extensive experience. Whereas, Ms. Hamilton is currently serving as the acting dean for the Academic Affairs at the community college and the Board has determined that the acting appointment should
be extended based on an extenuating circumstance.

There will be more to come with that.

    Board members have a copy of the
resolution in hand, as well as the job
description and you also have a copy of her
resume.

    Madam Chair, I'd like to move the
recommendation for the extension of the
appointment of Ms. Marilyn Hamilton as acting
dean of Academic Affairs of the community
college.

    MR. WYNER:  Second.

    CHAIR CRIDER:  It's been moved and
seconded. Questions?

    I do have a couple of questions. I
hope somebody is here to answer them. One of
them is this is Dean Hamilton's second
appointment. And I believe the language is that
they can be appointed for one year and then have
a one-year -- is this correct, counsel? They can
be one year and then a one-year extension? Up to
one year.
Does anybody know where we are in terms of a search? Because this anticipates her holding the appointment until a suitable replacement has been found. So is there a search being done for this dean?

MS. BLANCHARD: Myrtho Blanchard, Vice President for Human Resources. The CEO of the community college is currently reviewing the position descriptions and is looking at some restructure of the department. And she's looking at this position and she's asked that we extend that until she decides and puts the search out. The job description came to us and we're just classifying them now.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay, so we would anticipate that within the next year --

MS. BLANCHARD: Absolutely.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay. That's the only question I had. Any other questions, concerns, anyone?

All in favor of the extension of the appointment of Ms. Marilyn Hamilton as acting
dean for Academic Affairs at the community
college of the University of the District of
Columbia vote aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Any opposed or abstention? That
motion carries. Thank you.

MR. ASKEW: Madam Chair, I'd like to
now advance the executive appointment for Mr.
Erik Thompson as the acting vice president for
Facilities and Real Estate here at the University
of the District of Columbia.

Whereas, after the review of his
credentials, it has been determined that Mr.
Thompson is qualified for such position and has
been recommended to serve as the acting vice
president for Facilities and Real Estate at the
University of the District of Columbia based on
his knowledge, past accomplishments, and
extensive experience.

I'm going to also say, Board members,
that Mr. Thompson has been one of those
individuals that I believe most of us have seen
really grow into this position. He has certainly been the right-hand person of our former vice president of Real Estate and Facilities and it is without a doubt that he will be able to perform in these duties, given the fact that he's shown leadership for multiple projects here at the university which is reflected in what you see on our campus today.

So it is with great pleasure that we offer to you this Board this resolution in support of the appointment of Mr. Erik Thompson as the acting vice president for Facilities and Real Estate here at the University of the District of Columbia.

MR. WYNER: Seconded.

CHAIR CRIDER: It's been moved and seconded. All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

Any nays or abstentions? That motion carries as well. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. ASKEW: Madam Chair, I now move
the appointment of Ms. Smruti Radkar as the acting general counsel of the University of the District of Columbia. Ms. Radkar had been recommended to serve as the acting general counsel of the University of the District of Columbia based on her current experience as assistant general counsel at the university and her previous accomplishments and experience serving as a labor and employment and defense litigator in the private sector.

Whereas, it has been determined that she is well qualified for such position and that the recommended salary adequately reflects the job duties and experience. Again, I would just add that this would be Ms. Radkar's second tour of being the acting general counsel for the university. We all know the quality of her work. She and her team have worked tirelessly for this institution over the years and I most certainly agree that based upon her knowledge of the institution, based upon her knowledge of District law, based upon her knowledge of labor law and
her overall experience that we -- that you
support the recommendation for the appointment of
Ms. Radkar as our acting general counsel. I so
move.

MR. WYNER: Second.

CHAIR CRIDER: It's been moved and
seconded. Any discussion? All in favor, vote
aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Any opposed or abstentions? Then that
carries as well. Congratulations.

(Appplause.)

Our last one.

MR. ASKEW: Madam Chair, now I'm going
to have to ask Dr. Lyons to help me with his last
name. I think I can get past the Doctor and
Mohamad.

CHAIR CRIDER: Sepehri.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Sepehri.

MR. ASKEW: Sepehri. This is for the
appointment of Dr. Mohamad Sepehri as dean of the
School of Business and Public Administration.
Whereas, it requires that the president shall provide for a formal search and selection process to fill the position as the dean of academic colleges' positions. So it has been -- he has been recommended to serve as the dean of the School of Business and Public Administration at the university. Based upon his knowledge, past accomplishments, and experience serving as associate dean and director of graduate business programs, the division chair of professional management and international business at Davis College of Business which I believe is in Jacksonville, Florida.

Whereas, after review of his credentials, it has been determined that he is well qualified for such position and that the recommended salary adequately reflects the job duties and the experience. His resume is attached, along with the fiscal impact statement which reflects that there is adequate funds in the budget to support his salary.

Madam Chair, let me ask before I move
it, the appointment letter separate, right? This is not part of the resolution.

CHAIR CRIDER: Right.

MR. ASKEW: So I'm just going to keep it at that.

CHAIR CRIDER: Yes.

MR. ASKEW: So having said that, members of the Board, I so move the recommendation for the appointment of Dr. Mohamad Sepehri as the dean of the College of the Business and Public Administration.

MS. BENNETT: Second.

CHAIR CRIDER: It's been moved and seconded. Let me just have one comment in terms of the appointment letter. We did agree to strike some language in the appointment letter in an attempt to come up with some alternate language, depending on asking the Vice President for Human Resources to do a little bit of research for us. And then we'll deal with the executive appointment letter.

MR. ASKEW: Well said. And I would
just say we certainly welcome the opportunity to have him come here. The School of Business is where I say -- because I graduated from the School of Business -- where we make stuff happen. So I just hope that this candidate brings the energy that the School of Business deserves and is typically reflected in a school of business. When you start talking about finance, marketing and computer science and all those areas, we certainly need to make sure that we have a dean who is willing and committed to help us achieve the highest level of accreditation that we possibly can. And it seems to be from the resume that has been submitted that this person has the experience to do that and I hope that we will all ensure and support him in helping the university to achieve that goal.

So with that Madam Chair --

CHAIR CRIDER: All in favor of this appointment vote aye?

(Chorus of ayes.)

Any opposed or abstentions? None.
And that motion carries as well. So
congratulations to all four of these executive
appointments.

Okay, we can quickly go through the
rest of the agenda. I don't know that there's
anything that we really need to have in terms of
committee reports. Any aching or burning reports
that anybody wants to make? Trustee Schwartz?

MR. SCHWARTZ: Is there a resolution
for honorary degrees? Are you getting to that?

CHAIR CRIDER: Oh, it's not on the
agenda.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Madam Chair, it's item
3.

CHAIR CRIDER: I think you're working
from an old agenda.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Okay, thank you Madam
Chair.

CHAIR CRIDER: For the honorary
degrees. So it has to come to the full Board for
a vote.

So let me again just take a vote to
add that to the agenda.

MS. FRANKLIN:  Dr. Crider, I would ask
that Dr. Petty to come forward because that was
the honorary degree for Jeb Johnson and it was my
understanding --

CHAIR CRIDER:  Okay.

MR. SCHWARTZ:  Thank you, Madam Chair,
I wasn't aware of it.

MS. PETTY:  We had taken through
Academic Affairs a resolution for approval of an
honorary degree for the commencement speaker, but
his staff discovered that he cannot accept the
degree, so we asked to strike it from the agenda.

CHAIR CRIDER:  Okay, well, thank you,
Dr. Petty.

Are there any other actions or burning
information to report out of committee?

Mr. President?

PRESIDENT LYONS:  Yes, Madam Chair.

The issue of hiring staff for the student center,
as you know, I met with the CFO and talked to him/about positions that were needed for that
building. And we talked about the position ceiling issues and so forth. And what he explained to me is that if the funds for those positions are coming from student fees, then we could go ahead on with the appointments, but we must first send the information to the mayor because she would have to adjust the FTE numbers in the budget she submitted to the Council. And the Council would also have to make the adjustment. So if they had let's say 800 positions and we're going to hire eight additional positions, we'd have to go back and ask her to give us 808. But with the understanding that these positions will be funded out of student fees.

We met with Mr. Rickford and he has confirmed that there's sufficient dollars in the budget from what has already been collected and what would be collected going forward even if you don't take any new actions. So it's covered.

I'm a little concerned about what it means when you have to go to the mayor and ask
her to make that adjustment, but that's what has
to happen in terms of the numbers. We will
explain to her as she has explained to the
Federal Government that the city, the District
has its own money to do certain things with so we
hope that that argument would be received well
when we say well, this is coming out of our own
funds.

Dr. Epps, how many positions were we
talking about?

CHAIR CRIDER: And while she's coming,
would it be our plan to keep these positions
funded out of student fees or would we at some
point try to transition them to the
appropriation?

PRESIDENT LYONS: That's a judgment
that the university and the Board together would
need to make if student fees cover these
positions. I don't know if there's any reason to
make the switch. There might be some positions
down the road that you might want to add which
would be appropriated, funded positions and the
university would go through the steps to make 
that happen. But these X number, would in fact 
be funded by student fees.

CHAIR CRIDER: Okay.

DR. EPPS: Yes, there are 8.5 
positions, full-time positions. The director, 
the associate director, meeting and events -- can 
you hear me? I'm sorry. Meeting and events 
manager, the marketing coordinator and a half-
time administrative assistant and budget analyst, 
an information desk person, a scheduler, and day 
and evening managers and also we have the fitness 
center, so we did want to have a fitness center 
manager, because of the risk involved in having 
students in there without the appropriate 
supervision.

In addition, and that would come out 
of the -- we have a start-up budget which will 
start in May and go through September and then we 
would have -- and we had Don, too, Don Rickford 
to certify that the funds were there to do that, 
that we shared with the president and I out of
those $7.7 million, approximately, that has been collected in student fees, $5 million went to construction and therefore, $2.7 million would be left over in student fees and that does not include the fees that have been collected from students this year. So we definitely have the money for the start-up budget as well as the budget for the first year should we choose to use student fees and that's what we're proposing for the first year and if we bring in about a $1 million a year, there's no reason why we cannot support those positions in the succeeding years.

CHAIR CRIDER: Any questions? Okay.

Thank you.

Just quickly, no other committee updates. So the last thing would be an update on the Presidential Search Committee?

MR. ASKEW: Madam Chair, just two things from the Operations Committee and I'll just throw this out for whoever heads the committee. I would just mention just two things, or three things that I think hopefully will get
some attention as the Operations Committee reconvenes and the first thing is that we have had some initial conversations on the presidential house and we had started looking at options, but decided that in order to ensure that we have the appropriate information, whether it's enough for now, what we would do is we would secure someone who can help -- who is a professional at assessing the market and based upon looking at the housing market, give us a better and truer number of recommendations that we can pursue. We did look at a couple of them initially, but there is someone who is being contracted out who will be helping us with that and I'm sure whoever the incoming president is will have an interest in what happens with that.

The second thing I would report on is that we through your leadership, Madam Chair, there was a procurement audit or an audit that was being taken place and it included procurement and was going to look at our procurement practices and give some recommendations as to how
we could improve that process. And so that audit has been completed and Ms. Harris and team will be reviewing that document and I expect that they will be bringing that to Operations Committee some time very shortly.

And then the last thing I would mention about the Operations Committee -- what else do we have? Well, I'll just leave it at that. Those were the two big things that I wanted to report out on.

As it relates to the presidential search, just a couple of things. First of all, I think everybody has seen the composition of the Presidential Search Committee. I won't really go through that, but what I will say is that through this process we received approximately 90 people who expressed an interest in becoming the president here at the University of the District of Columbia. Typically, you see that between 37 and 50 people actually apply for positions at universities, so that tells you the pool of candidates that we, the Search Committee, had to
actually sort through. Obviously, this is an institution located in the nation's capital where there's an abundance of resources and so we were able to draw upon the strength of not only the university, but also of the jurisdiction in which we reside.

The publication went out to over 50 organizations either by advertisement, emails, phone contacts. I think some of you saw the advertisement, not only on our website, but in the Chronicle of Higher Education, Inside Higher Education, and the American Association of Community Colleges, Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, and again several other places.

We had a listing of all the attributes and the things that we were looking for in a president. What I found and I think what we found very interesting, I said we had a pool of about 90 candidates, when we asked for demographics associated with that and what we found is that 75 men applied for the position, 16
women. There were for position sitting presidents, there were three. Former presidents and chancellors, there were ten. Either executive vice presidents, vice presidents, vice chancellors and provosts, there were a total of 26. There were associate vice presidents and associate vice chancellors, there were three. There were executive directors at colleagues and universities, there were two. There were seven deans and four former deans. There were two former University of the District of Columbia faculty and there were four University of the District of Columbia current faculty. There were three alumni of the university who applied, one of which actually made it into the final eight candidate selection.

Hopefully, that gives you an idea of the type of talent that we had the opportunity to kind of sort through. So there certainly wasn't any lack of talent as we look at the numbers.

I think -- obviously, everybody is fully aware that we got the candidates down to
the top four and when we got to the top four, it went from the Presidential Search Committee and then went on to the Board and so from that we had our site visits here at the university and I can tell you that the advocacy for -- there was significant advocacy for the site visits based upon comments that we received from faculty. Comments that we received from students, comments that we received from Board members and comments that we received from other presidents at other institutions when we had a conversation about campus visits. Because as you may know, just like trends, as it relates to presidential searches, are actually changing, they're evolving. So not everyone believes that that type of visit is required. In fact, when you look Howard's presidential search, you don't know who the four finalists was there. But this university listened and this chair assured that we had a very diverse group of people who were in the presidential search. And again, I want to thank her for her leadership on that.
I think it's pretty public now that we are down to two candidates, Dr. Ronald Mason and Dr. Anthony Monroe. So the Board again is still deliberating. We, like you, want to make sure that we select the best candidate that we believe for this institution based upon the totality of what's required here at the institution. We certainly appreciate those of you who have contributed to the survey. Again, we tried to provide avenues in which people could voice their opinions to be considered.

As I look at the student trustee, I do want to thank her, not only for her participation on the committee, but for her innovativeness and creativeness and really reaching out to students very early in the process before she could even convene them to get their input on what they thought were the most important attributes of our next president.

And so with that, I would just, this is just -- that's my report and then if I may, Madam Chair, I would just like to make just some
personal comments. And I think the Board chair has already said that the most important decision that this Board can make is who the next president will be.

I have heard a lot of this, a whole lot of that. I've heard a whole lot of rumor. I've heard a whole of speculation. I've had people tell me and I'm sure other Board members are receiving this, too, stuff about fraternities and all this stuff. We've heard a whole lot of stuff. We have done our best to intake and receive from the various stakeholder groups including our primary funders to get everyone's input so that we can make a decision that we believe is in the best interest of the institution. We recognize that we're not going to be able to satisfy everybody here.

But what I can tell you what won't work for this institution if you really care about this institution, regardless of who we choose, you should commit your unwavering support to them because when there are small groups or
individuals that separate us, we lose focus.

This institution needs focus, right?

Again, I understand some of you have your own personal views and I would hope that you understand that we may have a perspective, but based upon the amount of information that we have, we have listened to you, but what we don't want to happen is that whoever we choose, you use it as an opportunity to divide us. We have seen where that has gotten us in the past and I would hope that you as the leaders at this institution will not allow that to happen. I trust you. This Board trusts you. We ask that you go out and show leadership because there are people who aren't here tonight, but it really is going to need your leadership.

So those students who may have had -- we're proud to have students come here and testify. But somebody gave them wrong information. That's not what we teach our students. It's not what we teach our students. When people do things like that, that's a
reflection of us, right?

So again, I just want to implore you because I worked for a corporation and when we see stuff like that, we want to stay as far as we can away, right? Because we don't want the drama, right? And so again as leaders, I'm hoping that you will join us, when we announce who this president is, I hope that we see all of you and whoever else we can get and we say we are all one family. We might not agree on everything, but we're going to figure this out and we're going to do it because we believe that Trustee Natasha Bennett deserves the best education she can possibly get. So with that, that's it for me. Thank you.

(Appause.)

CHAIR CRIDER: So again, I hate to lose Joe off of this Board. He brings a great deal of passion and commitment. He really believes in this university and it is very hard to find somebody that has his passion and his commitment. He hasn't let any of the stuff --
and he's gone through a lot of stuff -- as the chair when he was the chair that he didn't deserve, and no matter what, he continued to fight face forward for this university and I mean in my book he's the greatest. So I hope I can be half the chair that he was.

MR. ASKEW: Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIR CRIDER: And with that I think we --

PRESIDENT LYONS: Is it serious?

DR. EPPS: I neglected to say that we did have student elections and I know that Trustee Askew would be interested in that and that Theodore Wilhite was here earlier and he was our past student government president and has been very active on this campus. And he is our new student member of the Board of Trustees.

As president we have of the undergraduate student association, we have Joniece Barnes as vice president. We have -- I hope I can pronounce this correctly, Tsholofelo Motshwane. And as secretary, we have Mulenga
Chileshe. As treasurer, we have Anjanette Shelby. And for Ms. University of the District of Columbia we have Tatyana Calhoun; as Ms. Firebird, Nia Williams; as Ms. Homecoming, Tiffany Bridgett. And that is it.

And I hope that you will allow me to bring them to the July meeting if they are available so that you all can meet them. And I know you will be here as many of you possible, as we install these future leaders. And thank you, Natasha.

MS. BENNETT: Thank you, Dr. Epps.

(Applause.)

CHAIR CRIDER: I thank the Board for being so patient tonight. We had a long meeting. We haven't had one of these in a long time. But we covered some important issues. I think we worked through some things and I really do appreciate your patience in sitting through this. So we are adjourned.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 10:02 p.m.)
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