
President's Advisory Panel on University Namings and Recognitions

February 2, 2018

Turnbull Conference Center, Room 103, 555 W Pensacola Street

9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

Panel Attendees:

Members

John Thrasher- President of Florida State University
Renisha Gibbs- Chair
Miguel Hernandez
Maxine Jones
Karen Bearor
Walter Moore
Norman Anderson
Janet Stoner
Robyn Jackson
Allisson Yu
Kyle Hill
Andrew Melville [via phone conference]

Support Staff

Elizabeth Hirst
Danni Staats

The meeting began at 9:00am

1. Welcome

Panel Chair, Renisha Gibbs, welcomed everyone to the meeting and stated that she was pleased to have President Thrasher there with them, in response to some of the discussions from the previous meeting, where the panel had expressed a desire for additional guidance on their charge. She added that the President had been more than happy to attend when she spoke to him about coming, and proceeded to turn the floor over to him.

2. Discussion on Panel Charge

President Thrasher started by thanking Ms. Gibbs personally for all of the work she had done for the panel, noting that she was on several other similar committees as well, in addition to the numerous responsibilities of her full-time position. He also thanked the panel for their commitment to their charge, adding that he appreciated the time and effort they had been giving to such important work.

President Thrasher proceeded by indicating that the panel had been given the significant responsibility of examining the history of Florida State University (FSU), how we recognize our

buildings, and how we acknowledge people who have shaped the university's history. He added that over the past few months, the panel had heard several presentations, listened to comments from the public, and reviewed countless materials, all of which he had made an effort to also follow along with. President Thrasher recognized that the charge of the panel was a daunting task when you considered that the university traces its roots back 167 years, and currently has nearly 160 buildings on campus, not to mention countless markers, sculptures and other pieces of public art.

Based on the public input thus far, as well as the feedback he had received from around the city, state and country, President Thrasher asserted that there were a few campus landmarks that seemed to be at the forefront of many people's minds in the community, and acknowledging that this was something the panel had probably already heard, he outlined that those landmarks were the B.K. Roberts Hall, the Francis Eppes Hall, and the Eppes statue. He indicated that there were some who felt very passionately about this particular statue and the names of these buildings, and that he wanted them to know their voices were being heard.

President Thrasher asked the panel to prioritize those three landmarks as they continued their work, and requested that they submit their recommendations on these items first, so that the university could address any issues of concern, if necessary. He clarified that he certainly didn't want the panel to feel rushed, however, he thought that we owed it to our campus community to move forward on these priorities in a timely manner. He went on to explain that after that work was completed, he would like the panel to address the rest of their charge, including consideration of the current policy for namings and recognitions and making any recommendations they deemed necessary and appropriate.

President Thrasher emphasized that as FSU sought to become a more inclusive campus for all, he especially appreciated the panel's serious and thoughtful approach to these complex issues on how we recognize our past while respecting the values we hold today. He reaffirmed how seriously he took this particular project, and indicated to Ms. Gibbs that he would be happy to answer any questions the panel may have.

Ms. Gibbs asked the panel if they had any questions for President Thrasher.

Janet Stoner commented that during some of the panel's prior discussion, they had talked about formulating a policy, then testing that policy against specific cases, and indicated that to her mind, the three priorities President Thrasher had mentioned would certainly be the first to be tested, but that she wasn't sure if that was in-line with the new guidance he had provided.

President Thrasher responded that he saw those three items as being part and parcel to the policy and that he certainly didn't want to preempt the panel from doing any work in regards to the policy, but added that he felt those three issues were very important and wanted to make sure they were focused on as a priority.

Ms. Stoner thanked President Thrasher for the clarification.

Ms. Gibbs confirmed that there were no other questions.

President Thrasher added that the university was doing extraordinarily well, and had come to a better place after recently facing some difficult issues related to fraternities and sororities that he would be giving his continued attention to work through. He went on to say that FSU had a great semester ahead, which included an opportunity to bring in many new students, as the university had already received almost 50,000 applications, the most in FSU history. President Thrasher credited the record number of applicants to the university having a great faculty and great programs, but also because this institution was showing young people that we care about everyone who comes here, and asserted that the panel's work was a big part of that. He concluded by emphasizing how important the committee's work was to the university, and thanking the panel once again for their continued commitment to their charge.

Ms. Gibbs thanked President Thrasher for coming, adding that the panel appreciated his leadership and guidance.

[President Thrasher left the meeting.]

3. Public Comments

Ms. Gibbs opened the floor for comments and asked speakers to be mindful of the three minute time limit.

[Comment #1]

Matthew Williams thanked Ms. Gibbs and the panel for their time, and introduced himself as being a graduate of the FSU Law School, class of 2013; the current President of the Tallahassee Barristers Association, a voluntary Bar Association, which is also an affiliate of the Virgil Hawkins Chapter of the National Bar Association; and a former President of the Black Law Student Association (BLSA) at FSU. He asserted that he wasn't there to speak on behalf of FSU or BLSA, even though he'd had discussions with many other former BLSA Presidents, and they had all shared his views, but that he was there speaking on behalf of himself, and most importantly, on behalf of Virgil Hawkins. Mr. Williams stated that due to limited time, he wouldn't go into all of the history, but shared that at the end of Hawkins' long fight to get into law school, which had been repeatedly hindered by B.K. Roberts [Former FL Supreme Court Chief Justice, for whom the main building of the FSU Law School is named], Hawkins had made an agreement with the courts to give up his fight, if the University of Florida allowed the next qualified black applicant to get into law school. Mr. Williams added that in doing so, Hawkins made it possible for him to get into law school, and for this reason, he recommended that, without question, B.K. Roberts name should be removed from the Law School. He proclaimed that the fight to make this happen had been long and infuriating, and that he had been subjected to walking past [B.K. Roberts'] picture and seeing his name every single day, along with many other students that came before and after him, which was wrong and frustrating. Mr. Williams opined that B.K. Roberts had been racist, prejudiced, and narrow minded, and that he had refused to follow the law or the constitution, choosing instead to follow his hateful and bigoted beliefs to the detriment of this school, this state and society as a whole, making him someone that shouldn't ever be praised or recognized by any of those aforementioned entities. Mr. Williams stated that he had been a proud supporter of the FSU Law School for many years, making it clear

that this was due to the work of former Dean Don Wilder, and Dean Erin O'Hara O'Connor, who have supported this position in the past, and added that while he planned on remaining a supporter for many years to come, he and many of his colleagues, including the Tallahassee Barristers, would not continue to support the school if Roberts' name stayed on the building. He added that enough was enough, and asked that the panel please recommend Roberts' name be removed from the College of Law.

[Comment #2]

Cea Moline introduced herself as an FSU student majoring in Political Science and a representative of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). She inquired about whether the panel's meeting agendas could be made available ahead of time, and proceeded to explain that she was there about the Eppes statue, believing that it should be removed and that the panel should create a policy in-line with FSU's values, which would enable the statue's removal. Ms. Moline opined that having a statue of a slave owner at a majority white institution created an awkwardness that was affecting the university's relationship with the community by creating a rift, and added that when noted activist Angela Davis spoke on the issue during her time on campus, she had agreed that the statue should be removed and placed in a museum. Ms. Moline shared that there was a museum where the statue could be moved, the Legacy Museum: From Enslavement to Mass Incarceration, opening in Montgomery, Alabama, and asserted that the museum would display the statue with a plaque proving contextualization, making this option a great way to address concerns about maintaining/preserving history. She concluded by noting that, as transgender women, she and Madeline [Maddie] Hendrick used female pronouns, and the pronouns in previous minutes should be corrected.

Ms. Gibbs confirmed that the appropriate corrections would be made to the previous minutes, and that the agenda should typically be posted to the website, usually no less than 48 hours prior to a meeting.

[Comment #3]

Danni Vogt introduced himself as an FSU graduate, class of '77 undergrad, and FSU Law School graduate, class of '84, and declared that he was there [at the meeting] in support of renaming Roberts Hall. He stated that having B.K. Roberts' name on the building was troublesome when he was in Law School at FSU, and that it was still troublesome today, 30 years later. Mr. Vogt asserted that Roberts was a segregationist, and that while serving as Florida Supreme Court Chief Justice, he wrote two key opinions that kept [Virgil] Hawkins out of the University of Florida (UF) Law School, because he was black. Mr. Vogt noted that Roberts' actions might have been defensible in his time, although certainly not in today's, but that regardless of this, his actions also represented an ethical problem related to disobedience to a higher court. He explained that when Roberts denied Hawkins appeal, he was acting in direct defiance of the U.S. Supreme Court who had issued an order that Hawkins be allowed to attend Law School at UF. Mr. Vogt referenced a recent incident, in which the Alabama Supreme Court Chief Justice, Roy Moore, was removed from office after defying a federal judge's order to remove a Ten Commandments monument from the State Supreme Court building, and declared that based on this example, Roberts' disobedience would be considered serious misconduct by today's standards and would not have been tolerated. Mr. Vogt opined that putting Roberts' name on a public building was not appropriate, let alone on a hall of learning at a public

university, where they are trying to teach students ethics. He also shared that he had obtained several signatures on an online petition to change the name of Roberts Hall, and that an overwhelming majority had commented that the name was negatively effecting fundraising, specifically, hindering contributions to the FSU Law School. Mr. Vogt concluded that if having Roberts' name on the building was preventing many alumni from giving to the university, it was in effect keeping the Law School from being all it could be.

[Comment #4]

Jonce Palmer introduced them self as a sophomore at FSU majoring in Spanish and Russian, as well as a part of SDS, and noting that they preferred they/them pronouns, asked the panel to be mindful of that for the minutes. They continued by asserting that they didn't think Eppes deserved to have a statue on campus, that it sends a bad message to people of color who come to study at FSU, and that it would be similar to putting a statue of Governor Wallace on campus to recognize the good things he may have done, even though he also enacted some very bad policies. Before concluding, Jonce Palmer also indicated that SDS was going to be watching this issue very closely as the panel moved forward, adding that it was one of SDS's big issues that they cared about a lot.

Ms. Gibbs thanked Jonce Palmer and the rest of the speakers for all of their comments.

4. Current Issues Report

Ms. Gibbs moved to the next agenda item, giving Ms. Jackson the floor for her report.

Robyn Jackson referenced the articles sent out to the panel prior to the meeting, copies of which had been provided in their materials packets, and proceeded to outline the following:

- Article 1 (Two Parts)
 - a. *Columbus Mural*- Copy of the pamphlet being provided to visitors of the Columbus Mural at the University of Notre Dame.
 - b. *It is time for the murals to go*- A letter to the editor that shows the push and pull Notre Dame is experiencing in regards to their decision to leave the mural up, but provide context. As outlined in the letter, there are still people who don't think this goes far enough. Although the types of issues and institutions may be different, FSU is public, while Notre Dame is private, considering and preparing for all types of reactions will be important. Most likely can't please everyone.
- Article 2, *Who at UNC is calling for Silent Sam's removal now?* - Silent Sam will be a large topic of discussion as the panel continues their work. Since UNC is at a similar stage in their process, will be interesting to see what different groups get involved by expressing interest in issue, and also what UNC decides to do.
- Article 3, *While others tear down monuments, some universities are building new ones*- The University of Chicago saw fit to address their particular issue, by adding monuments, instead of taking them down, and did so in a way to create discussion on other ones. A way to recognize a different part of the university's history. Fill in a gap of ascetic artist piece. The panel will need to consider the amount of thought and attention needed, may need to bring people in.

Ms. Gibbs thanked Ms. Jackson, noting that her reports had been very helpful, and that she appreciated Ms. Jackson's work in keeping the panel up to date. She then asked the panel if they had any questions.

No questions.

5. Overview of Applicable Legislation

Ms. Gibbs welcomed Carolyn Egan, Florida State University General Counsel, to come forward for her presentation, explaining that she had asked her to give an overview of any applicable laws or legislation that may impact the panel's work. Before turning over the floor, she added that she thought Ms. Egan's presentation was timely, considering the guidance from President Thrasher regarding where he'd like the panel to focus and how he wanted them to prioritize their work.

Ms. Egan thanked Ms. Gibbs for inviting her to present, and because the speakers during the public comments had done the same, she mentioned her affiliation to the university, which including being both an undergraduate and Law School alum. She stated that she cared very deeply about the university and the Law School as well, adding that she had left her private practice in order to come back and serve the university as General Counsel, because FSU meant a lot to her.

Ms. Egan shared that she also cared very much about the committee's work and that she had actually volunteered Ms. Jackson, who was from her office, to lend her expertise to the committee, as Ms. Jackson had already been tracking the issues in the way that she has been reporting them to the panel, even before the committee was formed. She attributed this to the work being done in the General Counsel's Office that is related to speech on campus, student expression, and the impression FSU wants to put forward to the rest of the country and the world, about who we are as an institution.

Ms. Egan anecdotally explained that a lot of times, what she does for the university is letting people know where the curves are in an effort to keep them on the road and avoid the curbs, but that if/when they do run the curb, her office also serves as the mechanics who are going to help fix whatever damage may have been created. She noted that in regards to B.K. Roberts and the naming of the Roberts Hall, she thought she could provide some knowledge or history, but specified that she was a lawyer, not a historian, and that while she could go back and research what had happened with the laws, she couldn't say much about what happened at the time or why.

In the way of background, Ms. Egan shared that by and large, FSU does not own the property we are housed on and that the State of Florida is actually the title owner. The university has possession of the land by virtue of a very long term lease from the Governor and the cabinet, sitting as the trustees who own the land for the State of Florida. She explained that as the lessor, the university does have some rights, but that a lot of them are held by the State of Florida, and

that what we can do with the property is defined in FL Statute, FL Board of Governors Regulations, University Regulations, and University Policy.

Ms. Egan went on to state that the naming issue has evolved a little over time, and that a number of years ago, it was unclear as to what exactly our naming rights were. To that end, the State of Florida does not generally name buildings, highways, statues, etc., for living people, typically it was a memorial done for people who are no longer with us, and that this restriction seemed to be in place on the university for a while, with the only exception being an act of the legislature, who was the only entity with the authority to name state property after a living person. Ms. Egan asserted that when you go back in history with respect to the naming of buildings on campus, you will find that many of them came from an act of the legislature, and not from a university driven action.

She asked the panel to recall Tom Jennings' presentation on the naming committee from a previous meeting, where he had explained how the university goes about naming buildings now, and noted that the university did have a lot more leeway today, but that we were still left with the legacy of an era when State of Florida buildings were named by an act of the legislature. Ms. Egan indicated that while she was not an archivist and that it can be hard to get records sometimes, she had gone back and found a number of legislative acts that named a variety of different types of buildings on campus, including; the Kasha Laboratory Building, an academic building that is home to the Institute of Molecular Biophysics and was named for a faculty member; Tanner Hall, which is FSU's Police Department, an administrative building, and named for a former Chief of Police; and the Don Veller Seminole Golf Course, an athletics facility named for a former golf coach. She shared that she had also found that in 1973 the legislature introduced a resolution to name the structure that house the FSU College of Law, for B. K. Roberts, and that the action was ultimately codified in Chapter Law 73.370, but that records retention wasn't great during that time (1969-1974), and she wasn't able to find much more.

Ms. Egan explained that even though the university had a lot of authority over the namings on campus, at this point, the only way to undo a legislative naming would be a subsequent legislative action, and indicated that there would need to be a change in the name, a repeal of the current name, a referral to a campus committee to come-up with a new name for both the structure and the College of Law itself, and so forth. She asserted that the aforementioned options were for the panel to consider, but that she wanted to help with the mechanics of how to consider them to make their work productive. She added that while the panel had heard from a lot of very insightful people, who cared a lot about this issue, and believed that the university should change the name, the unfortunate fact of the matter was that the university didn't have the authority to do so in this case, but she recognized how frustrating that was, and wanted to help in any way that she could. Ms. Egan noted that the bill filing deadline had already passed for the current session going on, but offered that the University's Lobbyist may know of some other ways to get things done as well.

Ms. Gibbs thanked Ms. Egan and asked the panel if they had any questions.

Ms. Stoner asked if Roberts Hall was the only structure that fell under Legislative action out of the three priorities that President Thrasher had identified earlier in the meeting.

Ms. Egan confirmed that neither the Eppes building nor the Eppes statue, were named or placed by legislative action. She also noted that the university had a Campus Beautification Committee, and that she believed decisions about moving statues on campus would go through them.

Maxine Jones asked about whether Ms. Egan had been able to determine through her research that FSU as an institution had nothing to do with determining the name of Roberts Hall.

Ms. Egan indicated that she wasn't able to confirm either way, as she hadn't been able to uncover the votes, or any of the legislative/bill analysis, which is usually where information can be found about who had urged support of the action.

Ms. Gibbs confirmed that there were no additional questions and once again thanked Ms. Egan for coming.

6. Discuss/Develop Action Plan

Ms. Gibbs referred to the panel's packet of meeting materials, indicating that they should contain a draft "next steps" document, which outlined some of the things she thought the panel would want to consider while they tried to map out their path going forward. She asserted that she felt President Thrasher's comments from earlier in the meeting had been very helpful and that they had also been very clear in regards to prioritizing Roberts Hall, Eppes Hall, and the Eppes statue. Based on that narrowing or prioritizing of their charged, Ms. Gibbs proposed that the panel might want to give some thought to where they go from here to ensure they could meet the President's expectations in giving him a timely recommendation on those three items, and stated that she believed it was time for the panel to work on getting the feedback they needed from the community, but that she wanted to hear from the rest of the panel about what they thought their next steps should be.

Walter Moore stated that he would be interested in hearing more information about the naming of Eppes Hall/Statue, similar to what the panel had just heard about the naming of Roberts Hall.

Ms. Gibbs recalled that in a previous meeting, Ms. Varry had given the panel some general information about both and that she had also agreed to come back to share more, and stated that the question was whether this was the right time for her to do so. She asserted that she thought the panel would need to bring in other experts to vet any information they received, and most likely commission additional research before they could move to developing recommendations, but proposed that the appropriate next step at this point would be to get feedback from the community.

Norman Anderson agreed that the panel was at the stage to get more input and/or recommendations from the community, but indicated that he was struggling with whether or not to provide guidelines. He opined that having guidelines would help speakers narrow down their feedback, and in turn help the panel get what they needed.

Ms. Gibbs agreed that the panel would need to provide some structure in regards to what they were considering and what they wanted to hear in order to ensure that they could get the information they needed to develop a recommendation.

Kyle Hill inquired as to whether the panel would be inviting specific people/groups to the town halls, or if they would be open to everyone.

Ms. Gibbs indicated that this was something the panel would need to discuss and decide on as a group, but commented that based on previous discussion, there were some key groups she thought the panel would want to hear from, and that she felt the panel would for sure need to go to the law school, and possibly the Eppes building as well. Ms. Gibbs went on to explain that she didn't think the panel would need to have ten different meetings, but that in her mind, she saw the panel reaching out to certain targeted groups, such as alumni, students, and faculty, and then creating a space where those individuals would feel that this was the appropriate forum for them to come and speak. She also noted that while she wasn't opposed to having a town hall at Turnbull, she felt that most of them needed to be at other places on campus, where it would be easier for people to get to.

Allisson Yu asked if it might be an appropriate next step to have someone on Ms. Gibbs' team create a list of those different groups and locations for the panel to consider.

Ms. Gibbs agreed.

Ms. Yu also stated that she thought it would be important for the panel to be clear about how the town halls were different from the public comments given at the meetings, by being narrower in regards to the type of feedback they wanted to receive, to ensure that the town halls were not just another avenue to voice opinions, but a way for the panel to get the input they would need to make a recommendation.

Ms. Gibbs proposed that if the panel was in agreement about their next step being to move forward with these meetings, that they should spend some time discussing what groups they might want to reach out to, and what types of questions or guidelines they might want to pose to people that come to speak at the meetings.

Ms. Stoner recalled that someone had previously mentioned reaching out to the Black Alumni Association, and added that in addition to targeting key constituency groups, she felt the panel also needed to issue a community wide invitation. She also suggested that the panel might want to prepare a brief introduction, no more than 5 minutes long, in which they would outline their charge, their priorities, and what they had done to date, as doing so may help the speakers structure their comments in a more efficient manner.

Ms. Gibbs responded that she thought Ms. Stoner's suggestion was good and noted the feedback. She went on to list the following different groups that had been mentioned/identified thus far and asked the panel if there were any others:

Alumni Association, Black Alumni Association, the Tallahassee community, a number of student organizations, the campus community as a whole (i.e. faculty, staff, students), and people in the buildings being reviewed.

Mr. Hill mentioned that he thought there was some sort of professorship related to Eppes, and suggested that if so, the panel should reach out to those faculty members.

Ms. Gibbs confirmed that there was a professorship named for Eppes and agreed that it would be a good idea to reach out to those faculty members.

Ms. Stoner commented that she thought the panel would eventually still come back to writing a policy paper, and as such, suggested that it might be helpful to ask speakers to identify what the principle is that they are basing their recommendation on.

Miguel Hernandez mentioned that during today's meeting the panel had learned about other groups that they would need to coordinate with in order for their work to move forward, specifically, the Campus Beautification Committee in regards to the Eppes Statue, and the legislature in regards to Roberts Hall. With that being said, Mr. Hernandez suggested that the panel might want to see about having those groups come to the meetings at which those items are being discussed, so that they were also hearing whatever feedback the panel receives.

Ms. Gibbs indicated that she would talk to the University's Chief Lobbyist in regards to how that might work with the legislature.

Dr. Moore asserted that it might be good to reach out to the Faculty Senate.

Ms. Gibbs agreed, and asked the panel for more feedback regarding what they wanted to hear during these presentations.

Dr. Anderson indicated that he thought it would make sense to have people provide feedback specifically on Roberts Hall, Eppes Hall and/or Eppes Statue, since the panel's current priority or goal was to develop a set of recommendations on those three entities, and suggested that the panel also ask speakers to provide their rationale, because it would help the panel develop a policy later on. He also commented that he wasn't sure if there was already a policy which established that statues are considered permanent entities on campus, but if not, the panel should start with considering that things on campus are not permanent, but can change.

Karen Bearor stated that she thought the panel needed to ask the public how they envisioned preserving history in some way, noting that it was important not to just wipe it out, because it teaches us a lot on what to work against. She also asserted that since Tallahassee didn't have a local museum that could accommodate FSU's art if it was removed, the panel should ask for feedback on where those items should go if they were to be taken down.

Ms. Gibbs commented that in their research the panel had seen a variety of different options being used around the country and that it might be helpful to take some time to develop something that outlines those.

Ms. Jackson asserted that the panel wouldn't necessarily be seeking researched based feedback from the community, since they would be relying on University Historians and Archivists to research and vet information, and as such, she thought the panel should specify that they were looking for feelings or emotional reactions to pieces, and suggestions for solutions.

Ms. Gibbs agreed that the panel was more interested in knowing what people were thinking and added that keeping focused on how the community feels about these issues would be in-line with President Thrasher's intent for the panel.

Dr. Moore cautioned that in regards to the guidelines, the panel would want to be careful not to put such constraints on speakers, to where they feel like they aren't invited to speak if they couldn't rationalize their opinion.

Mr. Hernandez elaborated on Ms. Jackson's comments, proposing that the town halls be about encouraging community members to share the impact these names and/or structures are having on the overall goal and message of our institution, (i.e. What do you think FSU is communicating by having these items?). Mr. Hernandez recalled the public comments from earlier in the meeting, more specifically, hearing from law students and alumni about what it was like to navigate being black and walking halls named after an individual that worked to prevent their progress or their presence in that institution. He asserted that those types of insights were very important, especially for those members of the panel that don't identify and don't/didn't have that particular element to manage or overcome during their studies at FSU, because it can help them understand that part of a journey, that added component of feeling like you don't belong. Mr. Hernandez added that those accounts gave the panel contextualization they couldn't necessarily get any other way, and once again emphasized that "impact" was an element the panel needed to ask the community to share, in addition to "feel" and "opinion".

Ms. Gibbs agreed and stated that Mr. Hernandez's comments also made her think that the panel needed to do a specific reach out to College of Law alums, as well as some local legal associations, such as the Barristers Association.

Dr. Moore referenced Ms. Stoner's earlier idea about the panel drafting an introduction and suggested that if they did, they might want to be clear about what kind of options were truly available, or at least in regards to Roberts Hall, be clear about the university's inability to make a change unilaterally.

Ms. Yu asserted that it would be important to provide any kind of guidelines ahead of time, so that speakers could collect their thoughts and comments. She also opined that the three-minute time limit would need to be expanded, but that she wasn't sure by how much.

Ms. Gibbs clarified that the panel had been using three minutes as the standard time limit during public comments, because the panel's meetings had not been formatted for that purpose, however, since the meetings were open to the public, they had wanted to provide the panel an opportunity to hear from spectators that wanted to share. She indicated that she agreed, the panel would need to give speakers more time during the town halls.

Mr. Hernandez suggested using a format that he had used previously for another type of town hall meeting, where a facilitator posed questions to the audience and asked them to discuss in small groups, then larger and larger ones, with committee members placed throughout to help. He opined that using this format might help people work through their thoughts and develop their message.

Ms. Gibbs noted that the panel had no way to know who and how many people would come, which could make using that format difficult. She suggested that in an effort to keep things moving efficiently, the panel may want to utilize their website more as a mechanism to obtain feedback, by either pushing/publicizing the current feedback option, and/or creating some kind of survey that could be posted.

Ms. Stoner asserted that she thought the time limit for speakers should be 5-7 minutes and that while she agreed the panel would want to get a sense of what people were feeling, she thought it would also be important for the panel to request suggestions for solutions.

Ms. Gibbs agreed that 5-7 minutes would ensure efficiency for the panel and still provide sufficient time for the speakers, especially when they would also have the option to supplement their comments by submitting to the website.

Ms. Stoner commented that the town halls would be a great time to market the website.

Dr. Anderson noted that he liked the idea of the town halls being more open-ended, and having more specific questions on the website.

Ms. Gibbs stated that she liked that direction and thought it would work nicely.

Dr. Jones asked if the panel would just be listening, or if they would be posing questions as well.

Ms. Gibbs asserted that she didn't necessarily want the panel to get into a give and take/back and forth with the speakers, as the town halls were be more about getting the feedback and hearing from the public, but that she thought it would be appropriate for the panel to ask questions if there was something that needed clarification.

Andrew Melville suggested the new Black Student Union House.

Dr. Anderson inquired as to whether the panel would want to have any of the meetings outside of campus.

Ms. Gibbs suggested the Alumni Center, as it was more accessible to the public, and indicated that she would look into that option, along with some of the others that had been discussed, and would map out something for the panel to consider. She noted that the panel had another meeting coming-up pretty soon, on February 14th, and asserted that they would be in a position at that point to finalize. Ms. Gibbs also mentioned that Ms. Varry had submitted some additional

information she had been able to compile, in regards to previous policies, and that she'd be sharing those documents with the panel very soon, after she's had a chance to review.

Ms. Egan stated that she had found an answer to Dr. Jones' question and shared that Dean [Mason] Ladd, the inaugural dean of the law school, had written to the legislature encouraging the naming of FSU law school for Roberts.

7. General Comments

Ms. Gibbs stated that she thought the panel was headed in the right direction and that President Thrasher's guidance had been very helpful with getting them back on track. She then asked if anyone else had any other comments.

Ms. Stoner stated that she felt good about the meeting, as they had been able to participate in productive discussions and not just absorb.

Ms. Gibbs agreed, noting that with all of the information the panel had been given, they were now able to work on what to do with it. Ms. Gibbs stated that she and the support staff would be working hard to compile things for the next meeting, but reminded the panel that feedback or comments should be directed to Ms. Staats and they should feel free to reach out.

8. Next Meeting Agenda

Ms. Gibbs asserted that prior to the next meeting she might move forward with looking at dates for town hall, and noted that due to challenging schedules, the panel would need to move forward with a majority.

Dr. Anderson ask Ms. Gibbs if she had any ideas about when the panel would want to have the town halls done by.

Ms. Gibbs responded that she was thinking soon than later, but that the timeline would most likely be impacted by whatever recommendation she received from University's Chief lobbyist, as well as timing of the legislation.

Ms. Stoner asserted that she thought the panel should proceed with drafting a recommendation, even if they were too late to submit anything during this legislative session.

Ms. Gibbs clarified that she wanted to get a better handle on what was possible, and maybe stretch ourselves if an option was in reach, but that she had not meant to imply that the panel should halt their work if they couldn't submit something this session. She added that she agreed the panel should move forward regardless.

Ms. Stoner stated that the impression she had gotten previously was that President Thrasher would like to see recommendations from the panel sometime during this semester, and with that deadline in mind, she'd like to see the panel do several town hall meetings in a week to get them done.

Ms. Gibbs agreed, stating that she thought having all of the meetings in a shorter timespan would bring more attention to them and that her intent was to schedule them in that fashion, with her goal specifically being a two-week timeframe. She added that although the President hadn't given the panel a clear deadline for their work, she did also agree that it would be nice to have a recommendation on the prioritized items by end of semester, since he wanted to be able to at least address those in a timely fashion.

Ms. Yu noted that the panel had mentioned six different options/locations for the town hall meetings, however, she thought having no less than four would be sufficient if logistics presented a problem.

Ms. Gibbs acknowledged that the panel may need to make adjustments based on the availability of the different spaces, and that as previously discussed, they would need to look at different times in the day, possibly even in the evening, but indicated that they would work to create as many spaces as possible to get as much feedback as possible.

9. Other Business

No other business.

10. Adjourn

Ms. Gibbs stated that she appreciates the panel's feedback and active participation, and also reminded them to reach out to Ms. Staats if they have any questions or concerns.

The meeting ended at 10:18 a.m.