
President's Advisory Panel on University Namings and Recognitions

April 27, 2018

FSU/Training Center – Stadium Place, Room 205, 1300 Jackson Bluff Rd

9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

Members

Renisha Gibbs- Chair
Robyn Jackson
Miguel Hernandez
Maxine Jones
Maxine Montgomery
Karen Bearor
Walter Moore
Norman Anderson
Janet Stoner
Lane Forsman
Kyle Hill
Andrew Melville
Chris Pinango
Allisson Yu [via phone conference]

Support Staff

Danni Staats
Elizabeth Hirst

The meeting began at 9:01 am

1. Welcome

Renisha Gibbs, Panel Chair, called the meeting to order and proceeded to open the floor for public comment.

2. Public Comments

Ms. Gibbs reminded everyone that the public comments were limited to three minutes, per speaker, and asked that speakers keep an eye on Elizabeth Hirst, who would be providing periodic notice with regards to their time.

[Comment #1]

Audrey Pandolfi introduced herself as an FSU student in the College of Engineering and indicated that while she hadn't been prepared to speak first, she was there to comment on the Eppes statue, as she felt that it gave the wrong message.

[Ms. Pandolfi proceeded to take a long pause]

Ms. Gibbs offered to provide Ms. Pandolfi another opportunity to address the panel after the other speakers had made their comments, in an effort to give her more time to gather her thoughts.

Ms. Pandolfi accepted and returned to her seat.

[Comment #2]

Kitt Comellas introduced herself as an FSU student majoring in Studio Arts. She shared that, she had been organizing a campaign to get rid of the Eppes statue and change the names of the Eppes and Roberts buildings for as long as she had been at the University, but that she hadn't known anything about these recognitions/individuals prior to coming to FSU and that it would have been great if she did, as it might of affected her entrance. Ms. Comellas indicated that she wasn't certain why there was a statue for a man who wasn't technically the founder, an issue she was pretty sure had been touched upon by the panel in recent weeks, adding that regardless, she felt that anything short of removing the statue and Eppes' name would be representative of the University's willingness to say that for as much as we tout ourselves to be proponents of diversity and integration, we don't actually believe so much in either, because we are paying homage to a slave-owner, racist, and horrible person. She asserted that the same would be true if Roberts' name remained, because of his work to try to keep black students out of law school [in Florida], even after segregation had been abolished. Ms. Comellas commented that frankly, the situation was really a shame, because these landmarks shouldn't have come into effect and should have been removed long ago. She concluded by expressing her hope that the panel would make the right decision.

[Comment #3]

Katherine Draken introduced herself as an FSU Psychology student and began by stating that she thought the fact that there needed to be a discussion about removing a statue of a slave-owner, or that the [Eppes] statue was ever even [on campus] in the first place, was ridiculous, because she didn't believe that the recognition represented the values of FSU, or for that matter, anyone in the room. She added that while she didn't think anyone was intentionally trying to honor slave-owners, by having the statue on campus, the University was sending an implicit message that they did. Ms. Draken asserted that the University should be honoring people who fought against the institution of slavery, and against people like Francis Eppes, who had actively fought for it by supporting the Confederacy during the Civil War, and creating slave-catching militias in Tallahassee. She noted that in addition to the building and statue, Eppes was being recognized in other ways around Tallahassee, such as with Eppes club and Eppes Drive, and that in her opinion, honoring this horrible man in so many ways absolutely ridiculous. Ms. Draken stated that the fact that the FSU Law School was named after B.K. Roberts, somebody who supported segregation, was also ridiculous and that she was ashamed of the names chosen for these buildings. She reiterated that the message FSU was sending by having these recognitions was

that they didn't care about the black students at this University, about racism, or about the issues facing black students. Furthermore, FSU was erasing history and the historical struggles that had been fought for freedom by leaving statues like the Francis Eppes statue without even acknowledging the fact that he was a slave-owner and did horrible things. Ms. Draken concluded by stating that she hoped the panel would make the right decision today, showing that the University actually does care about the values that it claims to believe in.

Ms. Gibbs invited Ms. Pandolfi to come forward again.

Ms. Pandolfi declined to continue, as she felt that the other speakers had already covered everything she had wanted to say.

Ms. Gibbs thanked all of the speakers for their input and gave the floor to Robyn Jackson for her report on current issues related to the panel's work.

3. Current Issues Report

Ms. Jackson started by thanking the panel for being at the meeting and the public commenters for all of their feedback. She explained that she wanted to give an update on some of the things that were going on in the world of namings and on the committees that were doing the same type of work as the panel. Ms. Jackson referenced the two articles provided in the panel's packet of meeting material, the first being from Princeton, which wasn't about a re-naming, but had to do with an additional naming to recognize the diversity of some of the contributions that were made to their campus, including some from fugitive slaves and some other people of color who made some significant contributions to the institution. She outlined that the second article described an ongoing issue having to do with the statue of Dr. James Marion Sims in Central Park, and the decision that was made in New York City regarding the statue's removal, in recognition of some of the really significantly awful ways that Dr. Sims had made some advances in gynecology using women of color. Ms. Jackson reiterated comments she had made previously, that this was undeniably tough work, but that there are lots of groups managing the same or similar issues as the panel and that they're doing them in really creative ways, adding that she thought the panel had a lot of interesting ideas to work from if they wanted to look at some of the different things people were doing around the country.

Ms. Gibbs asked if the panel had any questions.

No questions from the panel.

Ms. Gibbs noted that it was helpful for the panel to receive these kinds of updates as they took on the same difficult task of making a recommendation, and thanked Ms. Jackson for the report.

4. Proposed Principles to be Considered

Ms. Gibbs moved to the next agenda item, the *Proposed Principles to be Considered*, commenting that there had been extensive discussion on the topic during the panel's last meeting, and that the panel's input and feedback had been used to develop the Proposed Principles document provided in the panel's meeting packets. She explained that while the panel had already been given an opportunity to review and send suggested edits, she wanted to talk about the final product to make sure everyone was comfortable with the principles being considered and that nothing was missing before they moved on.

Ms. Gibbs stated that the document starts with a presumption which asserts that, "*Requests should be reviewed with a strong bias toward maintaining a naming or recognition. Renaming and/or removal of a recognition should only be considered in exceptional circumstances*", and noted that there had been a consistent consensus from the panel with regards to including said statement. She confirmed that there were still no objections or changes to the presumption language, then proceeded to read each of the bulleted principle questions one by one, opening up the floor for discussion as follows:

- **Principle Question #1:** *Is a prominent legacy of the namesake (honoree) fundamentally at odds with the current values or the mission of the University?*
 - Walter Moore: I like that the question is referencing "a" prominent legacy, as opposed to "the" prominent legacy, which was the wording Yale had used.
 - Janet Stoner: I like that the statement acknowledges that there may be some imperfection in a person's history. The statement works adequately.
 - No proposed changes
- **Principle Question #2:** *Was the relevant prominent legacy significantly contested in the time and place in which the namesake lived?*
 - Norman Anderson: The issue of "place", and what that means, raises a question for me. Could mean Tallahassee, Florida, the United States, etc. Some clarification may be needed.
 - i. Ms. Gibbs: Wonder if "place" is even needed at all. Suggest using "time period" instead of "time and place". (i.e. "...contested in the time period in which the namesake lived")
 - ii. Panel agreed that specifying "place" wasn't necessary
 - iii. Ms. Gibbs: Proposed simply dropping "and place".
 - Was the relevant prominent legacy significantly contested in the time in which the namesake lived?
 - Panel agreed
- **Principle Questions #3:** *Did the University, at the time of a naming, honor a namesake for reasons that are fundamentally at odds with the values or the mission of the University?*
 - Ms. Stoner: In reference to "the time", was there any evidence that the values or mission of the University have changed over time? If not, would we need to specify the time at all? We've talked about how values can change over time and about trying to have a document that could be adaptable and used going forward regardless of those changes, but is there a presumption that "the time" is now?

- i. Ms. Gibbs: Believe the question is asking if the reasons used in the past to justify the recognition, are at odds with the University's values/mission today. Suggested adding "current" in front of "values or the mission of the University", to add context.
- ii. Maxine Jones: Several of the public speakers have brought up the Seminole Creed, to say that Eppes' and Roberts' didn't reflect the values of the aforementioned doctrine. However, I'd asked previously and am still unsure as to how far back the Seminole Creed goes.
 - Miguel Hernandez: Per my recollection, the FSU Student Creed was designed and adopted by the Student Government Association many years ago, and used by the student body prior to Dr. Coburn, who brought it forward into a more prominent/official use.
- Dr. Anderson: Comparing this question to the first principle, which was an evaluation of the honoree, and their legacy, the third bullet is more of an evaluation of the University, and the University's standards and/or values at that time. The question is did the University honor this person for reasons that are at odds with current values.
 - i. Ms. Stoner: I like Dr. Anderson's point.
 - ii. Ms. Gibbs: Agreed. Fundamentally, we can only talk about how the reasons match up to our current values and mission, because the question needs to help us determine if the recognition is appropriate/acceptable today, not back then.
- Ms. Gibbs reiterated her previous suggestion to insert "current" before "values;
 - i. Did the University, at the time of a naming, honor a namesake for reasons that are fundamentally at odds with the current values or mission of the University?
 - Panel agreed

- **Principle Question #4:** *Were the reason(s) provided as justification for honoring the namesake reasonably substantiated based on the records and information available at the time? Since then, have new records of relevance been discovered that contradict the information previously available and/or discredit the justification? Based on the aforementioned, do the contributions of the namesake to the University justify the type(s) of recognition that currently exists?*
- Maxine Montgomery: Don't know if "contradict" is the right word. Suggest maybe substituting with, "shed new light". Adds a level of nuance, which might be a better way to express the sentiment.
 - i. Ms. Gibbs: Agree "contradict" goes very far, a little harsh.
 - ii. Dr. Montgomery: The idea is that we've uncovered or recuperated new information that shed new light on what we thought happened in the past
 - iii. Ms. Jackson: "Shedding new light" could be referencing new information that provides context and/or accuracy in two different ways; (1) by filling in parts of the story we didn't previously have (i.e. learning about an honoree's disreputable actions) and/or; (2) by disputing/discrediting

previously known information (i.e. the honoree is being recognized for something they didn't actually do).

- Ms. Gibbs: Think the term “contradict” means we would need to completely discredit previous information, disavowing what we knew before, and I’m not sure I’m comfortable with the level of burden that creates.
- Ms. Jackson: In addition to replacing “contradict” with “shed new light”, maybe use “contextualize” in place of “discredit”. (i.e. “...shed new light on the information previously available and/or contextualize the justification”)
- Dr. Moore: This is the one principle that speaks to the importance of doing careful research before naming anything
- Mr. Hernandez: I don’t have a recommendation and love what’s being said, but my thoughts go to making sure we structure the sentence in a way that doesn’t water it down to a place that makes it feel comfortable, because the conversations and challenges we and other panels in future will have to confront will not be comfortable. Not suggesting that we keep “contradict”, but I like the power in the word, and the power in “discredit” as well. Today we are in a place, where as a community we can decide to shift and expand who has the power to tell story, and who has the power to give credit for actions. Want to find a way to phrase this principle so that we can empower panels of today and the future to take action, not just have a conversation.
 - i. Ms. Gibbs: Don’t want to set the bar too high, because sometimes there is a lot of gray. There are times we know something isn’t completely accurate, but we are still not sure or able to verify what actually happened.
- Karen Bearor: The question possibly needs a third term, something like what Mr. Hernandez mentioned.
 - i. Dr. Anderson: Suggest using all three terms proposed; shed new light, contextualize, and/or discredit.
 - Since then, have new records of relevance been discovered that sheds new light on, contextualizes, and/or discredits the information previously available and/or the justification for the recognition?)
 - Ms. Gibbs: Makes the question more succinct and clear.
 - Panel agreed
- Ms. Jackson: With regards to the last sentence, are we thinking about a hierarchy of types of recognitions? Such as a name on a building is greater than a statue, which is greater than an endowed chair. Do we need to think about the different types of recognitions and their levels, or what is meant by that?
 - i. Ms. Gibbs: Agree the wording contemplates levels, but I hesitate to put those in writing because they are hard to define. Going forward, someone may need to work in the gray area, and I would want them to have the option to do that.

- ii. Ms. Stoner: Since these principles will be used in the context of a proposed renaming/removal, the recognition type already exists, and is specific to the recognition that currently exists. I think when we go into the broader principles for naming, [proposal for a new recognition] the types/levels will need to be broken out, but not for these purposes.
 - Panel agreed
- Allisson Yu: Reads to me as a separate question. Should it be its own bullet?
 - i. Dr. Anderson: Interesting point. The bullet leads off with a question about history, which is referenced in the beginning of the last sentence, connecting the thoughts. However, I could see how it the question could be separate.
- Mr. Hernandez: Suggest replacing “based on the aforementioned” with “given that history”, or “given that new information”.
 - i. Given that history, do the contributions of the namesake to the University justify the type(s) of recognition that currently exists?
 - Panel agreed

- **Principle Question #5:** *Does a building or other recognition whose namesake has a prominent legacy fundamentally at odds with the University’s mission and/or values, or which was named for reasons fundamentally at odds with the University’s mission and/or values, play a substantial role in forming community at the University?*
- Ms. Stoner: Need help with understanding what “forming community at the university” means?
 - i. Mr. Hernandez: Concept of the Integration Statue comes to mind. Honors different parts of our history in many ways, and brings members of our community together with a sense a pride ever since being placed on campus in 2004, I believe. Thinking of this, I can see how different features on our campus can build community. Based on comments we’ve heard, many current and former students have said that they walk through campus and don’t necessarily know the names on the buildings, but I can see how stories about those names can create community. For example, a shared story during orientation, can create a sense of belonging for new people.
 - Dr. Bearor: The sentence needs to be restructured, so that it’s not about the building playing a role, but about the person.
 - i. Dr. Montgomery: Suggest dropping the intermediary clause; “...or which was named for reasons fundamentally at odds with the University’s mission and/or values”
 - ii. Dr. Bearor: Think we should put “otherwise” in the statement. i.e. “Do the contributions of namesake otherwise justify the recognition?” They may have done something unacceptable, but do their other contributions to the University and society otherwise justify the recognition?

- iii. Dr. Anderson: I think the question is really about the building/recognition and not the person. Using Mr. Hernandez's example of the Integration Statue, plays a role in forming community as a recognition of integration. The area in front of Westcott is another example, the fountain brings people together.
- iv. Lane Forsman: Thinking about how Colleges are housed in different buildings across campus, and how those buildings can form community, I recalled that Criminology and Social Work used to be in same College. When I think about the College of Social Work's mission, I wouldn't want to be housed with Criminology in a building named for Eppes, because the reasons he's being honored aren't applicable to mission of my College [Social Work].
- v. Dr. Moore: Seconded Dr. Montgomery's earlier suggestion to possibly drop the center of sentence
 - Dr. Montgomery: Wonder if the word "prominent" is necessary.
 - Dr. Anderson: The principle is trying to make a connection to the influence and/or legacy of both the building and the individual. The middle clause is assuming the prominent legacy of the individual is at odds with the University.
 - Ms. Stoner: Believe the idea behind the middle clause was covered in a previous question/bullet
 - Ms. Gibbs: Propose possibly leaving question as is. Keep in mind, these are our principles, and we need to think about what we are trying to accomplish with this principle. We're not married to anything, and I think it starts with what we think is important as a panel, which might be a little different from other panels.
- vi. Ms. Jackson: I think this question is trying to link back to the first and third bullet. If you answered yes to either of those, additional analysis takes place in this bullet to determine whether there might still be a reason not to leave the recognition as is. The question is unclear as written.
 - Panel agreed with Ms. Jackson's interpretation.
- Mr. Hernandez: The Integration statue is once again a beautiful example. We heard from a member of the Seminole Tribe on this panel, who spoke to the offensiveness of the feathers on Doby Flowers's headdress, yet the statue still captures historical context of when she was crowned as the first African-American Homecoming Queen, potentially is in conflict with the values of the Institution, and builds community.
- Dr. Anderson: The question should be worded in a way that the answer leads you closer to a decision. We need to think about how this question would help someone arrive at a decision.
- Ms. Stoner: Since parts of the question are already answered in other bullets, maybe the question needs to be; Does the building and/or other recognition play a substantial role in forming community at the University? Assuming you said yes

to the other questions, perhaps this principle is grappling for whether there is some other value to sustaining the recognition, such as that it creates community. However, creating community is interpretive and it's hard to speak to what's creating community today as an alum. Whoever makes that determination needs to be someone a part of the community at that time.

- i. Dr. Anderson: Interestingly, determining that the recognition could play a prominent role in forming community doesn't necessarily point in one direction or the other to leave or remove it, but it does contextualize some of the other answers and I like the interpretation/purpose of the question.
- Ms. Gibbs: Repeated the proposed question; Does the building or other recognition play a substantial role in forming community at the University?
 - i. Mr. Hernandez: Suggested "forming, challenge or divide community". Not all three necessarily, but something about dividing or breaking down community is what came to mind.
 - Ms. Stoner: Could be that the recognition plays a role in either forming or dismantling community.
 - ii. Dr. Montgomery: Could include "dismantling" parenthetically, but I don't have a preference.
 - Does the building or other recognition, play a substantial role in constructing or dismantling community at the University?
 - Panel agreed

➤ **Principle Question #6:** *Is the honorific recognition of the namesake having a uniquely harmful impact on members of our current University Community?*

- Ms. Gibbs: Do we all agree that this question is addressing a different principle from the previous bullet?
 - i. Mr. Forsman: I believe they are focused on different things. The previous question is looking at the campus community at large, as opposed to this question, which is looking at individual members or specific groups.
 - Ms. Stoner: For example, the College of Social Work Mr. Forsman mentioned earlier.
- Dr. Montgomery: With regards to "harmful impact", I don't know if that's something psychological, physical, emotional, financial, etc. Don't know if we need to be more precise. I'm assuming psychological, but might be wrong.
- Dr. Moore: Bothered by "uniquely". I don't think we need to put ourselves in a position to qualify that. The word has certain meaning that goes beyond what we need to say.
 - i. Dr. Montgomery: Agreed with Dr. Moore's point. Proposed "adverse" instead
 - ii. Ms. Stoner: Was going to suggest "negative", but like "adverse" as well.
 - Panel agreed to "adverse"
- Mr. Hernandez: The other reaction I had to this particular piece was around current University community. I think about where we sit in the city of

Tallahassee and the historical aspect of our institution, also what was permitted in terms of access for our African American brothers and sisters walking past our campus. When I think about our responsibility as a part of a community, I think about this statement as well to say, things that we erect, and individuals that we honor, we need to also keep in mind the community in which we are housed in or with. Would like to something that speaks to the community at large, not just the University.

- i. Mr. Forsman: I like Mr. Hernandez's thought, but would like to keep the "University community" that's already there [in the question] and add "community at large". Allows for both to be considered.
- o Dr. Anderson: Please remind me, what did we decide on the previous bullet?
 - i. Ms. Stoner: Does the building or other recognition, play a substantial role in constructing or dismantling community at the University?
- o Dr. Anderson: Wouldn't we have already answered the question about "harmful impact", since we added the piece about "dismantling community" in the previous bullet?
 - i. Mr. Forsman I don't believe so. The difference would be looking at the larger community vs sub groups.
 - Ms. Gibbs agreed.
- o Ms. Stoner: Do we need to include the larger community in both bullets talking about the University community?
- o Dr. Anderson: We need to keep in mind that each bullet doesn't need to be one sentence. Since we want future people to understand clearly, we may need to include nuances by adding sentences for clarification. However, I don't have any suggestions at this time.
- o Ms. Stoner: Proposed leaving the previous bullet [Principle Question #5] as is, or as the panel had already agreed, and only adding "community at large" to this question [Principle Question #6].
 - i. Is the honorific recognition of the namesake having an adverse impact on members of our current University community or the community at large?
 - Panel agreed

- **Principle Question #7:** *Does the manner in which the recognition is currently being displayed provide adequate explanation and/or interpretation, fulfilling the University's mission to further educate anyone who steps on our campus?*
- o Dr. Montgomery: Suggest the panel use one phrase to communicate the same idea in a succinct precise fashion.
 - i. Does the manner in which the recognition is current being displayed provide sufficient historical contextualization so as to advance the University's educational mission?
 - Panel agreed

- **Preamble**

- Ms. Stoner: The preamble doesn't clearly state that these principles are for renaming, which I believe is the intent. Document needs to be clearer that these are being adopted for reviewing the three landmarks and possibly for future renamings. No specific suggestion on language, but need clear differentiation. Ultimately, these principles might apply for naming, but they might also change. Additionally, I would also like to see Yale called out along with Princeton and Michigan.
- Ms. Gibbs: My vision would be that once we have our recommendations, we would outline the steps we took during this process, the principles we decided on, and how we used those to come to a decision. I think the preamble should be tweaked and incorporated into that document, but we should focus on finalizing the principles first.

Ms. Gibbs proposed that if there were no additional comments, she would call a short break to work on inserting the discussed updates for the panel's review.

No additional comments.

The panel took a brief break at 10:00 a.m.

The panel returned from break at 10:18 a.m.

Ms. Gibbs called the meeting back to order and indicated that the panel should have a revised copy of the principles document in front of them, which she asked them to take a moment to review.

Dr. Montgomery referenced the fourth bullet, and instructed that the pluralization in the second sentence be removed. She also noted that, in the fifth bullet, the comma after "recognition" should be removed as well.

Mr. Hernandez referenced the last sentence in the fourth bullet, recalling that the panel had agreed to remove "types of" to avoid the implication of there being different levels of recognitions.

Ms. Stoner reiterated that the preamble needed clarification with regards to the principles specifically being applicable to renaming.

Ms. Gibbs contemplated whether it would be helpful to remove the preamble altogether, since she saw the draft as more of a working document for the panel. She suggested that the preamble might be more appropriate in the final recommendation document.

The panel agreed.

Ms. Jackson inquired as to whether there was any concern with the possibility that the internal community likes a monument, but an outside group doesn't.

Dr. Anderson referenced Yale's principles document, noting the following statement; "We expect that renaming will typically prove warranted only when more than one principle listed here points toward renaming; even when more than one principle supports renaming, renaming may not be required if other principles weigh heavily in the balance."

Ms. Stoner stated that to Ms. Jackson's point, the constituents of the town were only given voice in the one bullet, but could potentially raise concern over several points. She opined that she wasn't sure this was a bad thing, as she assumed the University wanted to have a relationship with the town, and provide them an opportunity to be heard, but she proposed possibly adding a clause, similar to what Yale had in their process, which stipulated that once a request for renaming/removal was reviewed, it wouldn't be reviewed again.

Ms. Gibbs asserted that she saw these as guiding principles, but that there wasn't anything in the document that would make them automatic. She added that she was good with the community being left in the bullet, as she felt there was still some subjectivity to the question.

Ms. Stoner commented that outlining what it takes to raise an issue really gets into the process aspect, which would become a part of the panel's total recommendation, but clarified that she understood the complete package wouldn't necessarily be submitted to President Thrasher all at same time and that the process piece might come later.

Ms. Gibbs agreed that the panel would need to develop a more defined process further down the line.

Dr. Moore referenced the term "adverse impact" in the sixth bullet and suggested that they may need to use another word, or possibly add "significantly" as a modifier, so that the principle wouldn't come into effect if just a few community members were being impacted.

Ms. Stoner opined that she thought it would come down to the committee's use of the principle and their specific interpretation, but added that she hoped they wouldn't use the principle to address a personal/individual issue, and instead look at the larger picture.

Dr. Moore indicated that he hadn't really been thinking about that, but about whether we needed a modifier to clarify the level of impact to be considered. He provided, for example, that finding a statue aesthetically displeasing could be considered an adverse impact, but that he thought the question should more clearly imply that the impact should be more distressful.

Dr. Montgomery stated that she had hinted at Dr. Moore's point earlier when she suggested a change of wording that outlined the type of impact being referred to, and noted that when you say something has had a "significant impact", what that really means is subject to interpretation.

Ms. Gibbs commented that she wasn't sure the panel would be able to realistically specify everything and that they would need to make judgement call on whether the question was too vague, or sufficient enough to allow whoever comes behind them to make an appropriate determination.

Ms. Jackson outlined that with regards to the impact, the panel had already changed the description from “uniquely harmful” to “adverse”, and considering that modifiers had been used for other terms, having one that shows the impact is significant would be consistent with the document and give guidance to whoever used the principles going forward. As such, she was in support of adding “significant” as a modifier.

Panel agreed with adding “significantly” as a modifier for “adverse impact”.

5. Recommendation Options

Ms. Gibbs stated that her initial thought had been to take one of the three landmarks through the principles to start the discussion regarding what the panel’s recommendation might be, but at that point, she wasn’t sure if they had enough time left in the meeting, and she also wanted to see if panel members needed time to go through the principles on their own, before having a public discussion.

Ms. Stoner indicated that she would like to have some time with the finalized principle questions and proposed having a discussion about the possible options for their recommendation. She recalled reading about renaming, removing, and contextualization, but wondered if there were other options they should be considering.

Ms. Gibbs pointed out that there may be different option as it pertains to the statue, such as relocating.

Ms. Stoner proposed “adding” as an option, which would be about addressing the University’s need to educate the community with regards to our campus history. She also suggested that the panel might want to consider recommending that something be specifically added to educate the campus community about the involvement of slavery during the institutions early construction.

Ms. Gibbs agreed and asked if there were any other options to consider. She reiterated the list thus far; renaming, contextualizing, relocating, adding, removal, and leaving the recognition as is.

Mr. Hernandez proposed the concept of “retiring names”, explaining that the idea involved giving some grace to the process, which would allow a recognition to be removed and/or replaced with some respect. He added that it would also be about respecting the leadership of a time or period in which the recognition went up.

Ms. Gibbs indicated that she liked the concept Mr. Hernandez had suggested.

Ms. Jackson shared that she had also seen a University do a modification of an existing monument, which entailed “draping” the statue.

Ms. Stoner commented that contextualizing might also be changing the buildings name, if you were to retire the recognition, keeping the history in some way.

Ms. Gibbs stated that if the panel's recommendation involved any sort of removal, renaming, or change, she would like to also recommend that it be done in a way that allows people to maintain dignity.

Dr. Montgomery proposed the term "Affirmation" to reference a recommendation for "doing nothing".

The panel agreed.

Ms. Gibbs confirmed that she would make those last few edits to the principles and come up with a working document on possible recommendation options, both of which would be sent out to the panel prior to the next meeting.

6. Next Meeting Agenda

Ms. Gibbs asked if any of the panel members knew that they would not be able to attend the meeting schedule for the following Friday.

Dr. Bearor and Dr. Montgomery indicated that they would not be available to participate and Chris Pinango mentioned that he would be late due to an exam.

Ms. Gibbs noted that she thought the panel was making progress, and moving in the right direction.

Dr. Anderson suggested that in an effort to maximize efficiency at the next meeting, all of the panel members should take some time to look at the principles and submit their recommendations on action ahead of time, asserting that he was afraid they would run out of time if they waited to do that piece when they came together again.

Ms. Gibbs confirmed that everyone on the panel was agreeable to that option and asserted that she would send everything out as soon as possible with instructions on how and by when the panel should submit their feedback to Ms. Staats. She added that while she was fine with taking that route, she wanted to make sure everyone was clear that it wouldn't preclude the need to still come together. She went on to explain that it was important for the panel to still have appropriate discussion on the issues, as different perspectives could inform the direction they ended up going in.

The panel agreed.

Dr. Montgomery asked if the option for public comments would be made available at the next meeting.

Ms. Gibbs responded yes, confirming that there would be time in the agenda for public comments at every panel meeting.

7. Other Business

No additional business.

8. Adjourn

Ms. Gibbs thanked the panel for their time, then adjourned the meeting.

The meeting ended at 10:48 a.m.