

---

---

## President's Advisory Panel on University Namings and Recognitions

November 20, 2017

Turnbull Conference Center, Room 103

3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

---

---

### Panel Attendees:

#### Members

Renisha Gibbs- Chair

Miguel Hernandez

Lane Forsman

Maxine Jones

Karen Bearor

Walter Moore

Norman Anderson

Janet Stoner

Maxine Montgomery

Robyn Jackson

Kyle Hill

Kyle Doney [via phone conference]

#### Support Staff

Elizabeth Hirst

Danni Staats

### **The meeting began at 3:00 p.m.**

#### 1. Welcome

Renisha Gibbs, Chair of the Panel, welcomed everyone to the meeting, and noting that she recognized the challenges of coming in during a holiday week, she extended her appreciation to the panel for being there and being focused on their very important work.

Ms. Gibbs referenced the materials that had been placed at each panel member's seat, and indicated that, along with the agenda, they should each have a manila folder containing a number of handouts. She explained that the first handout was a copy of the University's Naming Policy, and that later in the meeting, a special guest, University Vice President Tom Jennings, would be presenting an overview of the policy to the panel and answering any questions they may have. Ms. Gibbs outlined that she viewed the panel's first meeting as "organizational", and that she expected the next two meetings, including today and the meeting scheduled for December, to be more "educational", asserting that she hoped to give the panel a lot of information holistically about the buildings and monuments across campus. Referring back to the packet of materials, Ms. Gibbs stated that the panel had been provided a list of active building names, and an overview of campus buildings that were dedicated in honor of specified individuals. She indicated that the information was a bit dated, having been compiled in 1986, but noted that most of the buildings were still on

campus. She shared that University Archivist, Sandra Varry, would be visiting the panel at the next meeting to go over the list in more detail and provide updated information. As such, Ms. Gibbs encouraged the panel to review the documents and be ready with questions. She also reiterated once again that she wanted to focus on getting the panel as much information as possible during the next few meetings. She stated she anticipated the panel would have more substantive discussions about specific topics when they returned in the New Year after the Winter Break. She indicated she would need to hear from the panel regarding their desires on topics they would like to focus.

## 2. Public Comments

Ms. Gibbs opened the floor to public comment, with a reminder that same as the previous meeting, anyone speaking should limit their comments to three minutes. She also noted that speakers would receive notice when they had one minute remaining, and again once their time had expired.

[Comment #1]

Cea Moline introduced herself as the President of *Students for a Democratic Society* (SDS) at FSU, and a Political Science major that would hopefully be graduating at the end of the year. Ms. Moline first stated that she would once again be talking about the Francis Eppes statue [*Ms. Moline made a public comment at the Panel's first meeting on October 30, 2017*]. She followed-up to clarify that she would actually be giving more information about the building the statue stands in front of, the Eppes Criminology Building. Ms. Moline opined that many people believe the Criminology building was named after Francis Eppes, because he was known as “the father of the Tallahassee Police Department (TPD),” but that according to documented information, Eppes had originally started a slave catching militia for the purpose of catching runaway slaves, and that only once this became illegal with the passing of the 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment, was the militia converted into a police department. In addition, Ms. Moline asserted that most of those in attendance at the meeting, should know that there was a loophole in the 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment, which led to the police arresting people on small charges, such as jaywalking, and collecting prisoners to be used for unpaid labor. Ms. Moline indicated that [allowing the Criminology building to be named for Eppes] was really upsetting, and more so based on her contention that the department had the largest proportion of black students on campus. Ms. Moline urged the panel to think of the Seminole Creed and FSU's Mission Statement, along with the University's history and the information she had presented today when moving forward to make these new policies.

Ms. Gibbs stated that she appreciated Ms. Moline coming in again, and while the panel would be happy to see her at every meeting, they would be going over their plan for public input later in the agenda. She added she hoped Ms. Moline was staying for the rest of the meeting, as they wanted to explain how they were going to solicit public feedback to ensure that Ms. Moline could be the most efficient with her time.

[Comment #2]

Zachary Schultz shared that he was at the meeting with Mr. Moline and other SDS members, to talk about the input they wanted to have into the new policy. He indicated that they looked forward to an examination of what other Universities were doing across the country in regards to removing recognition of racists, slave owners, and other figures that don't belong on college campuses. He

explained that SDS had been doing their own research and that they would like to give the whole panel a packet of information, including a bibliography of sources, which outlined Eppes' role as a major slave owner in Tallahassee, the ways he provided material support to the confederacy, and his role in the racist policing of Tallahassee. Mr. Schultz concluded his comments by asking if the different materials being provided to the panel for review and consideration would be posted on the website or if they could be acquired in some other manner to ensure that the public could have the same information and share in the collective process.

Ms. Gibbs indicated that she anticipated talking about that further and thanked Mr. Schultz for his input.

[Comment #3]

Danni Vogt introduced himself as a three time graduate of FSU, detailing that he graduated from Florida High in 1972, received an undergraduate degree in 1977, and law school degree in 1984. He added that his dad completed his doctorate at FSU in the late 60s and his mom worked at FSU in Molecular Biophysics, to further support his statement that he is a big supporter of the University. Mr. Vogt indicated that he was at the meeting to talk about B.K. Roberts Hall, and offer his services to the committee by providing any information they may need. He shared that while in law school, he found a stamp in an FSU law book that said, "Property of FL A&M College of Law," and in researching the oddity he discovered what he considered to be a grave injustice. Mr. Vogt explained that through his research he found that Virgil Hawkins [*A 39-year-old black public relations official of Bethune-Cookman College*] had applied to the University of Florida (UF) Law School in 1949, and after being denied, took his case to the Florida courts where he was repeatedly denied admission over a 9 year period. Mr. Vogt noted that based on his research, the Florida A&M Law School was actually started to give black people somewhere to go [to study law], and asserted that B.K. Roberts was primarily responsible for this happening, as he had written several opinions in defiance of the United States Supreme Court's decision in Brown Vs. The Board of Education, two of which saying they would not let Virgil into UF, even though the Supreme Court pointed out that there was no reason for delay. Mr. Vogt stated that they had tried to get the Law Library named after Vigil Hawkins, but that the legislature hadn't approved it. He also stated that his intention was not to discredit B.K. Roberts, as he recognized that he was very instrumental in getting the Law School built, but that he wanted to give the panel the information they needed to make the best recommendation. Mr. Vogt indicated that he had a lot of literature, and that he was starting a website with all of the information, which he hoped would be available for the panel by the December meeting.

Ms. Gibbs thanked Mr. Vogt for his comments.

[Comment #4]

Donna Cotterell introduced herself and stated that while she was originally from Massachusetts, she was able to trace her enslaved ancestors from both sides of her family back to the area. Outlining some of her family's history, Ms. Cotterell described how her great-great grandfather had been sold at auction when he was 8 years old, and how her Native American great-great grandmother had been saved by enslaved women who had taken her in and then begged the master to keep her when he found out and wanted to kill her. Ms. Cotterell explained that she wanted to share that information to say that there are statues erected to slave holders/slave owners, but that

it's a painful past and a painful history. She indicated that she wasn't sure if the panel was aware, but that this month marked 200 years since the beginning of the Seminole Wars, which lasted 41 years. Ms. Cotterell noted that she was not an FSU student, but that she does have two masters' degrees, and she teaches history to 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, and 6<sup>th</sup> graders at a private school in the area. She asserted that the history [in Tallahassee] is racist, and that teaching history to her students could be difficult, especially when textbooks made General Lee out to be a magnificent soldier fighting for his state, and for his country, but he had had the nerve to say, "If all the slaves belonged to me, I'd free them all, but they don't, so I have to defend my home state." Ms. Cotterell shared that her dad had been the first Police Chief in Midway, and that in the late 50s he had come up to Tallahassee to protest bus segregation, but not knowing that the protest had been canceled, he boarded the bus anyways and not realizing the full impact of his actions until many years later, he now has a footprint on the Civil Rights Heritage Walk for having a part in the desegregation of the bus system in Tallahassee.

Ms. Gibbs thanked Ms. Cotterell for sharing, and after confirming that there were no additional public comments, moved to the next agenda item.

### 3. Review of University Naming Policy

Ms. Gibbs invited University Vice President Tom Jennings to come up to the podium for his presentation on the University's Naming Policy and reminded the panel that the meeting materials they were provided contained a copy of the policy for their reference.

Mr. Jennings thanked the panel for having him, and also for taking the time to discuss these important issues and working on such an important project. He shared that he had come to FSU in the summer of 2010 from the University of Virginia (UVA) where they had been discussing these issues at length to find ways to help recognize many aspects of the past, and noting that he understood what an undertaking this was, he applauded the panel for the work they were about to do.

Mr. Jennings stated that before he had even arrived at FSU, the University President at the time, Eric Barron, had called him about trying to hammer out the beginnings of a Naming Policy, which they did, because at the time, there was no known policy across the FSU Foundation and Seminole Boosters. He explained that once he had arrived, he put together four task forces to address some of the main issues that needed to be resolved in preparation for a million dollar campaign, one of which was to put together a coherent Naming Policy. He continued that the current policy was largely the result of one such task force, but added that the original policy had been modified twice since being adopted in 2011. Acknowledging that the panel had already had a chance to look through the policy, Mr. Jennings indicated that he wouldn't read it to them, but instead thought he would highlight some of the context, and proceeded to outline the following:

- The policy introduction specifies who the policy applies to; all campuses, buildings, departments, and so forth, and also defines terms used within the policy.
- General requirements of the policy are:
  1. *Person should have a close association with FSU.* Some examples would be employees, former employees, or alumni and friends; a friend being someone who has

- donated money, or provided significant service to the University over a long period of time.
2. *Donor recognition doesn't need to be tied to gift for a specific building.* Allows the University to ask donors to give to programmatic needs and aspirations of the institution, and then recognize their gift in one of the many, very attractive public spaces across campus that are currently unnamed. Deans, Department Chairs and so forth were asked through the Development Officers at the FSU Foundation, to do an inventory of those types of spaces, the idea being that this allowed them to solicit or attract additional philanthropic support for an endowment, or other immediate spending needs of a department, since gifts didn't need to go directly to renovating the space where a it was recognized, if a renovation wasn't needed.
  3. *Funds exceeding the philanthropic costs can be applied elsewhere.* Related to the previous requirement, if a space does need to be renovated, and a donation is made that exceeds the cost of said renovation, then the excess can be used for another purpose or need within that department.
  4. *Donors should fulfill pledges in five years or less, and naming of the space considered when 50% of a pledge is received.* Also offers flexibility to work with donors to be recognized before that threshold is achieved, which is done on a case by case basis. Donors who have a history of giving to the University and paying their pledges on time, given the size or the nature of the gift, the University is able to recognize a donation before 50% is received. Often times, donors that don't have a donor history with FSU will be asked to frontload the pledge and held to the 50% rule before they are recognized.
  5. *Once something is named, the name can be changed, but would take significant circumstances.* There has to be a strong reason why something would be renamed, and typically this is often the moral turpitude clause. An example might be someone like Kenneth Lay, the founder of Enron who was convicted of fraud, but in a situation where such a person was arrested after they had already made a donation and the University decided that keeping the name would be damaging to FSU, the Board of Trustees (BOT) has the flexibility to rename the building/space. *Names can also be changed for failure to complete a pledge.* There have been instances, even recently, where the University has done this, because a donor hadn't paid the full pledge amount, even after they were given an extension.
  6. *No promises or commitments regarding naming should be made before final approval.* For the benefit of the University's Development Officers, Deans and others, who are out there soliciting gifts, because the University wouldn't want anyone representing that the naming opportunity is a done deal, as it's really under the preview of the Committee on Campus Names, and at or above certain thresholds, the BOT. When working with donors, it's important that this specific requirement is written down in their gift agreements, and the Naming Policy is referenced.
  7. *Only the President may make exceptions to the naming policy, with final approval from the BOT.* Allows some flexibility in case there is some circumstance that needs to be attended to immediately.
  8. *Policy shall follow all statutory requirements.*

- The policy also contains specific requirements for naming physical structures, academic units, and endowments.
  - Physical Structures
    - For a naming suggestion to be considered, the donor must contribute at least 50% of the private philanthropic costs, which is not necessarily the total cost of the building, as funding may come from multiple sources, such as state funds, private funds from donors, and/or departmental funds. Example: If the total cost of a building was \$20M, and the State was covering \$10M, then the philanthropic cost would be \$10M, and a “lead donor” would need to contribute \$5M or more before naming would be considered. However, when gifts are tied to state matching funds and those fund fall through, the donor is then responsible for putting forth 50% of the total cost in order to get the naming opportunity.
    - Temporary namings typically involving athletics. Generally, many Universities will have namings on the floor of their basketball court, their soccer arena, or other sports facilities for a finite period of time. Businesses, like Wells Fargo for example, will pay a fee to either the Athletics Department or to their agent, to have their logo displayed for maybe 5 or 10 years.
    - Colleges undertaking fundraising campaigns to pay for buildings are asked to develop a list, in advance, outlining all of the naming opportunities that will be available, from the whole building to large rooms and even individual professor’s offices when appropriate, and to also put a price on each based on both the philanthropic costs and market factors. There must be some assessment of the donor base, and what the market will bear when going into big building projects. The prices that other universities were able to attract for their buildings, or for the naming of their colleges are also used as a benchmark.
  - Academic Units
    - Gifts are typically from an endowment that defrays a large portion of the operating cost for that department or the college.
    - Market benchmarks, such as benchmarks established by looking at other Universities of similar size and prestige, are used in an effort to make the best estimate of what our market will bear and in terms of the prospective donors that are believed to be there or could be there.
    - Provost plays a role, and will need to provide advanced approval.
  - Endowments
    - Most are for student scholarships, professorships, or things related to a professor’s work, such as travel and research funds.
    - Currently, there is a \$25,000 minimum to create an endowment at the foundation, but that amount is likely to increase after the current campaign ends in June of 2018 and with the plan being to revisit it in September.
- Administration of the Policy
  - Mr. Jennings is the Vice President that oversees the administration of the policy
  - He engages with the Committee on Campus Names regarding every gift over \$100,000 and occasionally if he thinks there is any question, or something that might be sensitive to the campus community. Typically for gifts under \$100,000, the department or unit heads is responsible for any naming recognition in their area/spaces.

- Although FL Statute 267.062 stipulates that no state building, complex, road, etc. will be named after a living person, it also carves out an exception that allows State Universities to do just that. The policy requires additional approval from the Board of Governors and the BOT.
- Procedures for a namable space
  - Spaces with a philanthropic cost of \$1M or more, require approval from the Committee, the President and the BOT. Prior to going through this process, the donor has already signed a gift agreement that references the naming policy and made aware when the additional step involving BOT approval is required. Development Officers are also trained on how to manage donor expectations.
  - Mr. Jennings rotates a master list of naming opportunities with proposed gift amounts and updates that list on an annual basis, most recently in the summer of 2017.
- The composition of the Committee on Campus Names is specified in the policy.
- The policy references the Naming Opportunities Guidelines, which is an 8 page internal document, available to Foundation Development Officers and used as a “how to” guide for putting together a list of naming opportunities. The guidelines were not included in the policy, because they also contain an outline of thresholds for endowments, which change from time to time, and being that any policy changes are approved by the BOT, leaving the guidelines out avoided any possible delays that may be caused by BOT schedules.

Mr. Jennings concluded his overview of the policy and asked the panel if they had any questions.

Janet Stoner inquired about donors who hoped that their gift would lead to a naming opportunity and whether they ever put contingencies in their signed agreements, or if they were committing their money without a guarantee. She also wanted to know if donors ever backed out of their agreements when a naming opportunity didn't come through.

Mr. Jennings explained that whenever you have a donor who wants to help a specific project, but also want to be recognized within that building project, most often those types of gifts are dependent on approval from the Board of Trustees, and/or the Dean's committee. He described a recent example in the College of Business, where they had recently been accepting gifts for the purpose of building the new Legacy Hall with the expectation that the gifts would be recognized in the Hall. In order to ease donor concern, they had added a clause to stipulate that if sufficient progress hadn't been made on the building after 5 years, than the donor and the Dean could determine where else in the College of Business the money could be better utilized. Mr. Jennings also noted that a similar stipulation had been made when a donor stepped forward with a \$100,000 gift for the new Student Veterans Center, in which case, the agreement specified that if the center didn't materialize in 5 years, the gift would go to the College of Social Sciences and Public Policy. Mr. Jennings indicated that the money had ultimately gone to the College and that the Dean had worked with the donor to identify a new purpose for the gift that would be both meaningful to the donor and useful to the College, based on their needs.

Norman Anderson asserted that the policy seemed to be related to naming opportunities tied to donations or gifts and asked if there was another policy that would be applied when something was named in the absence of a gift.

Mr. Jennings responded that there were two parts to the answer. He addressed the first by confirming that there are some namings tied to long serving employees, which will come through him, and in turn, the approval process outlined in the policy. Mr. Jennings cited the example of when former Dean, Nancy Marcus, had retired, stating that there were people on campus who had wanted to do something to honor her for her many years of service, and for being instrumental in creating the Honors and Fellows House. He went on to explain that he had asked administrators to put together a proposal after someone suggested that a large conference room on the top floor of the aforementioned building be named for her, and that once the proposal had been submitted, it went through him, the Campus Naming Committee and then ultimately the President for final approval. For the second part of the answer, Mr. Jennings suggested that the committee might want to look at both FSU Facilities and the Athletics department, indicating that both areas have different committees for naming specific items. For example, for campus beautification like putting a name on a bench, it was not required for that item to come through the Campus Naming Committee. He indicated the Athletics complex is another example, as the rights to that space can be sold.

Maxine Jones asked about the Campus Naming Committee's process, and whether a history was provided when a name was proposed, and/or if the committee inquired about where the money came from, or how it was made.

Mr. Jennings stated that typically they have done the "homework" on their end while working with a donor, but that a lot of research is done before a gift is ever received. He added that there were 6 people in the FSU Foundation Office that are responsible for donor research and who work with the University's Development Officers to manage their portfolio of donors. Mr. Jennings also described the general process to involve a Development Officer putting together a 1-2 page draft document that the dean will sign off on, the document comes to him for review, and if there are no questions he will forward it on to the Namings Committee.

Dr. Jones asked if there had ever been a situation where Mr. Jennings had not forwarded a proposed name on to the committee.

Mr. Jennings indicated that he couldn't think of time where that had happened, and attributed that to the Development Officers sorting out those types of potential problems long before it gets to the point of a gift. He acknowledged that the University has had some controversial donors, but asserted that in those situations, there are two main principles: (1) Was the gift money earned legally; and (2) is it something that the University can actually use, i.e. it wouldn't make sense to accept a gift for a department/program we didn't have.

Lane Forsman asked if there could be a situation where a building would be named without a specific donor, and if so, whether there was any specific guidance on selecting that name, outside of the financial requirements laid out in the policy.

Mr. Jennings responded that he believed namings under those circumstances would still go through the process outlined in the policy, but asserted that he would first speak with Vice President Janet

Kistner, and Provost Sally McRorie, so make sure they didn't have any concerns before he started that process.

Mr. Jennings concluded with a clarification regarding what the panel heard about Eppes Hall during the public comments, indicating that the College of Criminology was located in Hecht Hall or Hecht House for many years, which was in pretty bad shape. He explained that the Dean had sought out assistance from the President with finding a new building, because they had one of top rated Criminology programs in the country located in what most people considered the worst building on campus. Mr. Jennings stated that a decision was then made to renovate Eppes Hall and that the College of Criminology moved in sometime in 2012, but indicated that he wasn't sure there was really any tie between Eppes and the College of Criminology, except for maybe something that was made up after the fact.

#### 4. General Comments

Ms. Gibbs thanked Mr. Jennings for his time and asked the panel if there were any general comments.

Miguel Hernandez expressed his appreciation for Ms. Gibbs' staff, who had put together binders for the panel, indicating that the materials were extremely helpful and that being able to review information about what other Universities were doing in regards to namings and recognition had been very informative in terms of trying to wrap his mind around all of the different perspectives and related scenarios.

She thanked Mr. Hernandez for his feedback.

Ms. Stoner asked if there had been any particular selection criteria used when determining which colleges to research for the binder, adding that Mr. Jennings had mentioned coming to FSU from UVA, where they had been discussing these issues at length, but that there wasn't anything in the binder about that University.

Ms. Gibbs responded that there hadn't been any specific criteria used and explained that they had gathered the information by doing an in-depth search and review of what had been happening around the country, specifically looking at higher education, but noted that she didn't think the binder materials were exhaustive. She confirmed that she had made a note to research what UVA had been doing or at a minimum follow-up with Mr. Jennings to learn more about his experience, and that she would pass along any information that was found, while they continued their research on what other Universities were doing.

#### 5. Website Review/Public Input Plan

Ms. Gibbs asked Danni Staats to pull-up the President's Advisory Panel website on the monitor.

Ms. Gibbs explained that the website would continue to be enhanced as they moved through this process, but that she wanted to make sure everyone knew how to find it and directed everyone to

the link. She pointed out that the schedule of upcoming panel meetings was posted near the top of the website, on the right hand side, and indicated that sometime after the Thanksgiving break she anticipated the meeting minutes being added there. She also noted that as they continued to receive public records requests for the different panel materials, they would most likely be posting that information in same area to ensure those materials could be distributed efficiently, and were readily available to the public.

Ms. Gibbs asked Ms. Staats to scroll down a bit to show everyone the newest feature that had recently been added to the website, the *FSU Community Input and Feedback* section, stating that it offered an opportunity for all of the various stake holders, both internal and external to the university, to communicate their comments to the panel without having to come in person to the panel meetings. She explained that any feedback submitted using the comment box provided, would be done so anonymously, but that there was a drop-down menu allowing individuals to select a category that most accurately described their role within the FSU community, and added that she anticipated providing any feedback received to the panel at their meetings. Ms. Gibbs encouraged the panel to refer constituents to this option when approached with questions or input, but also affirmed that the website would not become the only way to communicate with the panel, and that they would continue to solicit feedback through multiple types of forums to ensure the panel could hear the prospective of all populations represented in the university community.

#### 6. Next Meeting Agenda

Ms. Gibbs reiterated that her goal would be to provide the panel with as much information as possible, but stated that as they moved forward she would be looking to them for guidance on where they wanted to focus, such as on a specific building or statue, and also how they wanted to go about getting feedback from constituents. She reminded them that they had been charged with seeking input from all stakeholders prior to any decisions ever being made, which also committed them to engaging constituents through various types of interactions and asked if they thought having town hall type hearings should be their next step.

Ms. Stoner asked if the hearings would be focused on soliciting feedback from specific constituent groups and whether the panel needed a process to identify major stakeholder.

Ms. Gibbs responded that those were the types of things she wanted the panel to collectively come to a decision on and that she was open to feedback, but that she personally had seen the hearings as more of an open forum. She proposed that while they would need to provide opportunities to everyone that wanted to give feedback, the panel could have segmented forums for larger groups such as students or faculty, and added that as a panel they might want to consider whether input from certain groups can or should be given more weight, but asserted that they should first receive input from whomever wants to give it, then decide on weight.

Mr. Hernandez recognized that the public forums would be very important, but indicated that he would appreciate time to review and contemplate all of the information they had already been given.

Ms. Gibbs indicated she would welcome thoughts on how those public forums should look, balancing thoroughness with efficiency.

Ms. Stoner asked how the information about the panel and public hearings, etc. is being communicated.

Ms. Gibbs stated that the plan was to do an announcement after Winter Break to direct people to the website. She indicated using the media and press would be more important when announcing public hearings, and they would also reach out to certain groups such as the alumni.

Dr. Montgomery cited the Black Alumni Association as a specific group that should be included.

Ms. Gibbs confirmed that reaching out directly would be appropriate for that group and similar constituent groups.

Mr. Hill asked if the panel was looking for input on specific buildings or broad input on the process.

Ms. Gibbs agreed that was a question worth discussing and she thought we would start broadly and then need to narrow it down. She suggested that the panel should have an additional education meeting, then possibly another meeting and then moving into town halls or public forums.

Dr. Anderson stated that based on the mandate from President Thrasher, the panel was charged with creating a policy before getting into the specific names of buildings. That may take more time to ensure a “deep dive”. He also suggested helping to guide public comments to get more specific information.

Ms. Stoner suggested that staff provide a list of potential constituent groups so we can ensure we provide the opportunity for input from those groups.

Ms. Gibbs agreed that everyone who wanted to give input needed that opportunity.

Ms. Gibbs indicated the agenda for the next meeting would include guest speaker Sandra Varry, an overview of building names and history, and possibly someone from Facilities to speak about the committee referred to by Mr. Jennings.

Ms. Stoner asked when the meeting minutes would be posted and would they be on the website.

Ms. Gibbs indicated she would work with IT to get the minutes posted on the website.

Dr. Montgomery asked if the panel could access the public comments submitted online.

Ms. Gibbs stated that she could run a report to share with the panel, but they would not be available online. She indicated the panel should give additional thought about the specifics of the Universities policy. She also stated that naming process for non-donor situations may not be a clear cut process so the panel may need to review that issue further. She asked if there was any

more feedback. [No feedback]. She asked the panel to respond promptly to messages from Danni Staats, Support Staff, and to provide her with a valid email address.

Ms. Gibbs check with Kyle on feedback regarding Duke University.

Kyle Doney stated that Duke University had removed the Robert E. Lee statue and clarified that wasn't mentioned in the materials. This was very recent.

Ms. Jackson suggested an update at the beginning of each meeting to review any changes nationally and to update the group on climate changes. She offered to take the responsibility of researching and providing update at each meeting.

Panel agreed.

Dr. Moore asked if he would receive minutes by email or would they be posted to the website moving forward.

Ms. Gibbs responded that staff would send out minutes via email for panel to review and make edits and ensure people are accurately represented. Once minutes were finalized and posted, they would be notified.

**Meeting Ended at 4:08 p.m.**