
President's Advisory Panel on University Namings and Recognitions

April 16, 2018

Turnbull Conference Center, Room 103, 555 W Pensacola Street

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

Allisson Yu [via phone conference]

Support Staff

Danni Staats

The meeting began at 9:00am

1. Welcome

Renisha Gibbs, Panel Chair, called the meeting to order and took a moment to identify the panel member(s) on the conference phone line [*Allisson Yu*], before opening the floor to public comment.

2. Public Comments

Ms. Gibbs welcomed the first speaker to come forward and reminded everyone that the public comments were limited to three minutes, per speaker.

[Comment #1]

Danni Vogt thanked the panel for looking into these issues and introduced himself as an FSU graduate, class of '77 undergrad, and FSU Law School graduate, class of '84. He stated that he was there to speak in favor of renaming B.K. Roberts Hall, mainly because of the opinions Roberts wrote while serving as the Florida Supreme Court Chief Justice in the 1950s, which kept Virgil Hawkins from attending law school at the University of Florida (UF), solely because he was black. Mr. Vogt noted that the segregationist aspect was of course troubling, but added that Roberts took it another step further by writing two more opinions in which he continued to find reasons to keep Hawkins out of UF's Law School, after the U.S. Supreme Court had already

issued an order that Hawkins be allowed to attend. Mr. Vogt referenced comments made during one of the recent Town Hall meetings, by former FL Supreme Court Justice, Harry Lee Anstead, asserting that Justice Anstead had said that he and his colleagues found Roberts's opinions to be so reprehensible, they had issued a public apology to Hawkins's family, which was the first and only time this had ever been done by the FL Supreme Court. Mr. Vogt also recalled that at the last panel meeting, President D'Alemberte had commented that while segregation had once been accepted, Roberts's opinions were behind for his time, when most of society had moved forward. Mr. Vogt stated that he knew the panel was considering their recommendation for a policy or policy revisions, and indicated that he thought the overriding concept for such a policy should be equality and treating people fairly. He added that the country had been founded on the principle that all men are created equal, and although this only included white men at the time, society has evolved and the principle now extends to women and people of color. Mr. Vogt opined that having a building named for a segregationist was not the image FSU wanted to project to the nation and the world, noting that it hurts recruiting and fundraising. He concluded by urging the committee to consider renaming Roberts Hall.

[Comment #2]

Courtland Culver expressed appreciation to the panel for listening and introduced himself as an Economics major, class of 2019, who was there to speak in favor of keeping the Eppes statue. He acknowledged that his position diverged from the common opinion, and indicated that he wanted to suggest a different approach. Mr. Culver noted that the most commonly heard idea was to take the statue down and place it in a museum to avoid the potential effect of erasing history. He queried however, that what was a museum, but a place of education and what was FSU, if not the same. Mr. Culver asserted that he didn't look at the statue and think, 'wow, what a great man', instead he thought of him as an evil man who had slaves, and felt pain for what this man upheld in the past. He opined that if you don't have constant reminders, there's a good chance that history will be repeated and that we need to educate people about our roots and how no matter how evil something or someone may be, good can come out of it.

[Comment #3]

Stefan Babin introduced himself as an FSU Undergrad studying Criminology and Political Science, the President of Christians United for Israel at FSU, and President of the Economics club. Mr. Babin noted that he would be reiterating some of the comments he made at the last meeting and asserted that monuments like the Eppes statue were not here to glorify everything an individual had done, but that it was about keeping an objective record of history. Supposing that the statue was removed due to Eppes association as a slave holder, he queried as to where you would draw the line. Mr. Babin opined that under the same criteria, the argument could be made to remove all mention of the founding fathers, and as a more recent example, President Franklin Roosevelt for his policy of Japanese Internment during WWII. He stated that we have a responsibility to make sure that our history isn't erased or glossed over, otherwise, people would have no way to remember it, and noted that new generations were born every day, who needed to learn the same lessons we have from our history. Mr. Babin concluded by asserting that people need reminders to know what was wrong, or to know what to do better, and thanking the panel for their time.

Ms. Gibbs confirmed that there were no additional comments, and moved to the next item on the agenda after thanking the speakers for their input.

3. History Presentation

Ms. Gibbs invited John Cable to come forward for his presentation, and indicated that he had been working with the panel to answer some of the questions they had submitted about things they wanted to get resolved. She introduced Mr. Cable as a current PhD candidate in the Department of History, with a BA in history and an MA from Georgia College, as well as an MA in history from FSU.

Ms. Gibbs stated that she believed the presentation would be educational for the panel and that she would give them an opportunity to ask any questions they may have, but added that she wanted to make sure they understood that Mr. Cable focused on doing his best to put together a picture based on the verified information he was able to find and that depending on the records available, it may not be possible to definitively answer some of their questions.

Mr. Cable thanked Ms. Gibbs for the introduction and for inviting him to present. He reiterated that the focus of the presentation was to provide context, and not necessarily to answer the specific questions, but hopefully he will have done that by the time he was done sharing the information he was able to find. Mr. Cable moved forward with his PowerPoint presentation and provided the following additional context:

- Francis Eppes, was first and foremost a planter, also an early citizen of middle Florida.
- Important to talk about the issue of Indian land
 - Letters from Andrew Jackson to people like John C. Calhoun shed light on what happened in 1818, when the land was taken from the Miccosukee inhabitants.
 - Jackson entered from north and west, through a smaller settlement near what is now the Tallahassee Mall. Whole area that we now sit would have been greater Miccosukee land.
 - Men who eventually came down noticed how fertile the land was as marching through and wanted to purchase land. Jackson was pretty detailed in his letters about what he did as he came through. Burned down about 30 wood framed houses. Not just some transitory encampment of native people, their town had existed for a long time. Everything was either burned, or collected and taken.
 - White settlers came down and divided the land into plots, which could be purchased in 80 or 160 acre tracts.
- Eppes's first plantation, L'eau Noir, or "Black Water", would have been located west of Miccosukee, and east of Centerville. A descendant of Eppes noted a reimagined picture of the land that represented no previous settlers. Eppes established this first plantation between 1827-1829 and would add on as the years went on.
- Eppes and his family traveled down from Virginia in a long caravan, the idea being safety in numbers, and were followed by a group of hundreds of slaves. Grueling journey, people would have died on the way.

- Part of the second great migration. Land in north was not as fertile, people started moving down and taking land from natives. Modest dwelling for a while, what we would consider frontier life.
- Eppes increased his slave holdings as he became more successful. Census information includes the number of slaves in each household. First just a number, then in the 1850-60s they started including a line with more specific information; age, gender and color (black or mulatto). Everything but a name.
- Eppes would eventually build a second larger plantation, Lake Lafayette, and a larger number of slaves would have been located there. After his wife died giving birth to their 6th child, Eppes sold L'eau Noir and moved to Lake Lafayette permanently.
- Slaves and debt collateralization; plantation owners paid back advances using return from their cotton crop, but they didn't always have enough of a return. One way to repay their debts was to auction off their slaves and/or land. [Provided example of announcement in the newspaper that showed a man named Facias was holding an auction to pay his debts to Eppes.]
- Regarding public service, and Eppes's role as an alleged slave catcher, records show that he served as Justice of the Peace first and then became Intendent of Tallahassee, which is similar to a Mayor. Started as Justice of the Peace in 1830, and being a slave catcher within the county would have been a part of his official duties. According to the 1833, Territorial Act, Justice of the Peace was to divide their county into patrol districts, and men within a certain age range were required to serve as patrollers. The document also goes into the measures allowed to "correct" those slaves that were found trying to escape.
- Creating a society where race was subjugated, free white people and unfree white people. Must be policed constantly, because there was always a threat of an uprising. Not only by slaves but Seminole society nearby.
- A lot of the government hadn't been established in the area yet, and Eppes was a man known for bringing order and positive influences, such as establishing churches in the area. [Snippet from news, shows Eppes was serving as Secretary of the Vestry]
- Also part of several committees and boards that established through several evolutions what is now FSU. Devoted to the cause of education.

Mr. Cable asked the panel if they had any questions before he transitioned to speaking about B. K. Roberts.

Miguel Hernandez noted that Mr. Cable had mentioned that it would have been within Eppes's role as the Justice of the Peace to administer "corrective action" to the slaves within the area, as needed, and inquired as to whether there was any of documentation about his treatment of the people he had owned.

Mr. Cable stated that Eppes didn't leave a long paper trail, and that there were actually more letters in the archives from Eppes's wife, Susan, than from him. As such, we just don't have as much personal information on him like we do from other planters, since historians are most often able to glean what a planter's disposition was to their human property by reviewing their letters or journals, although sometimes hints can be in Ads they posted.

Norman Anderson referenced a slide in which Mr. Cable pointed to Eppes's role as a trustee on the Board of Education, and asked if he could elaborate more on that, because there had been a lot of talk about Eppes's part in founding the University, and he was interested in hearing Mr. Cable's thoughts.

Mr. Cable responded that everything he had seen listed Eppes as one of many people attempting to get the seminary established and that he hadn't found any documentation that indicated or implied that Eppes was "the" guy leading the charge. Eppes was often listed as the secretary, or one trustee among many. Mr. Cable added that another gentleman had written an article on the subject that he could share with the panel, but confirmed that he had never seen any evidence in the records here that Eppes was the only one involved.

Dr. Anderson asked if Mr. Cable had come across any documentation regarding slave labor that was used in building the university.

Mr. Cable indicated that he hadn't, but clarified that that didn't mean it wasn't out there.

Kyle Hill asked if Mr. Cable had found any documentation showing that Eppes's family had donated the plot of land the University was first built on.

Mr. Cable responded that he hadn't, but once again, stipulated that that didn't mean it wasn't out there.

Ms. Gibbs inquired as to whether Mr. Cable would have expected to see more about Eppes being the founder in the records, if in fact that was the case.

Mr. Cable stated that he would have expected to see more, and shared that in the 1940s people had written about the history of Antebellum Tallahassee, but while several had mentioned Eppes, he was featured as a reforming Intendent, not as a founder of what would later become FSU. He went on to add that if Eppes had been the leading contributor in FSU's founding, he would have expected that to be played-up more in the authors' narratives, especially since Eppes was the grandson of Thomas Jefferson. Mr. Cable clarified that while this was what he gleaned right now, he didn't want to be say anything definitive without having seen further documented evidence either way.

Walter Moore commented that when Mr. Cable says Eppes was a "reforming Intendent", it sounded like he was a force for order.

Mr. Cable agreed that "reform" was one of those words that could change wildly with the context of the time, and that when used to reference Eppes's performance as Intendent, it would have implied some very objectionable things to us now, such as putting down a slave uprising in a very distasteful way. Mr. Cable noted that the description could also mean that he was notably a temperance advocate, who sought to bring more organized religion to the area, and indicated that there really was a mixed bag of implications that could be applied in this context.

Janet Stoner asked if the paper Mr. Cable had mentioned a moment ago was the same one that the panel had recently received by Michael Rashotte.

Ms. Gibbs confirmed that it was the same one, as she had provided Mr. Cable the paper he was referencing.

Ms. Stoner asked if Mr. Cable felt that Eppes went beyond the mandate of the Justice of Peace, based on what he had gleaned from his research.

Mr. Cable responded that he wasn't sure if Eppes had brought a particularly strict mandate with him, or if he just went along with a stricter set of rules, but he did know that others in the area were considered pretty lax in their duties by comparison, and that the difference was seen as a pretty big gap when you looked at everything that snowballed into what eventually became the Seminole Wars. He added that if nothing else, it seemed clear that Eppes wanted to do his job well, and other intendants weren't able to hack it.

Mr. Hill asked if Eppes was Intendent in 1851.

Mr. Cable indicated that he couldn't confirm off the top of his head and would need to verify.

Ms. Gibbs confirmed that there were no additional questions from the panel regarding Francis Eppes.

Mr. Cable moved on to the second part of his presentation, and provided a brief overview of B.K. Roberts with regards to his part in the Virgil Hawkins case by outlining the following:

- B.K. Roberts served as a FL Supreme Court Justice from 1949 until 1976 when he retired. During his time on the Supreme Court, he was appointed for a two year term as Chief Justice three different times.
- Virgil Hawkins was an employee of Bethune-Cookman College when he applied to the UF Law School and was rejected solely because he was black. When Hawkins took his case to the courts, he was offered a scholarship to attend law school elsewhere until the all black law school was completed, but Hawkins refused. His case bounced around, repeatedly pointing back to Brown v. Board of Education and other cases in which black people were admitted to previously segregated schools. The case ultimately became about States' rights, and States' sovereignty.
- Roberts heard the case while serving on the FL Supreme Court. In an opinion authored by Roberts, he spoke of "serious public mischief" that would result if Hawkins was admitted, and under this guise that it would threaten public safety, he opposed Hawkins' admission.
- A survey of questions had been sent out to all manners of folks, but most responses would have come from white southerners. Way to elicit fearful and negative responses to delay desegregation. Roberts argued that the responses were a reason to delay desegregation, in order to avoid violence.

- Roberts was not the only one at the time with the same opinion. Justice Terrell wrote a concurring opinion, which included a quote about segregation being as old as the hills, and not having been considered a problem until recently.
- When describing his career, Roberts was referred to as a “law and order” type, referencing that he was “old school”, in a more racist way.

Robyn Jackson referenced what she thought could possibly be a piece of lore, which was that during one of proceedings, Roberts had refused to listen or had turned his back to Hawkins, and she asked Mr. Cable if he’d seen anything in the court records about that happening.

Mr. Cable asserted that he hasn’t seen anything in the case file or the New York Times articles covering the proceedings that described Roberts as refusing to listen or turning his back and opined that while he couldn’t be certain, you would think that something like that would have been tracked or mentioned if it had happened.

Ms. Stoner stated that the panel had previously heard that Roberts had contributed greatly to the judicial system in Florida and asked Mr. Cable if he knew of anything else that he would take into account to assess Roberts as a whole.

Mr. Cable recalled that Roberts had helped start a wild life preserve, was loyal to friends, and was in general a warm, consonant, southern gentleman, who was game to a number of causes. He added that Roberts had purchased most of Alligator Point at some point and after selling off tracts of land for the same amount that he had paid for the entire property, he was able to be very generous with the wealth he had gained.

Mr. Hill asked about Roberts’s role as founder of the law school.

Mr. Cable explained that everyone had thought that with his connections Roberts could jump start the process, and in fact, he was able to have a skeleton faculty on board and start the next year.

Ms. Stoner asked if there was any connection with the FAMU Law School closing and if Roberts had anything to do with it.

Mr. Cable responded that such information was beyond his purview.

Ms. Gibbs confirmed that there were no further questions and thanked Mr. Cable for his presentation.

The panel took a short break, starting at 9:54 a.m.

The panel returned from break at 10:01a.m.

4. Principles to Consider

Ms. Gibbs brought the meeting back to order and noting that the presentation had been very helpful, expressed her hope that the panel could still move forward with their plan to discuss possible principles. She asked for confirmation from the panel, explaining that she wanted to make sure everyone was in the same place, and ready to begin discussions, although maybe not quite ready to come to a resolution.

The panel unanimously confirmed that they were ready to discuss principles.

Ms. Gibbs stated that she wanted to start by talking about everyone's thoughts on the key principles and suggesting that they go around the room to share, asked if any of the panel members wanted to start.

Maxine Jones went first, stating that she thought naming and renaming should be treated as separate things, and suggested that for renaming, the panel needed to examine the namings and/or the individuals in context. Dr. Jones offered for example, that albeit morally wrong, Eppes didn't do anything legally wrong, and pointing out that he had also been born and lived in a slave society, she opined that she didn't know if the panel could judge him on something that was an accepted part of American society at the time. Dr. Jones added that going forward she thought the University could be a little stricter about guidelines for proposed namings.

Ms. Gibbs agreed that it was important to see the separation between naming and renaming, and specified that for the purposes of their discussion, the panel should start with focusing on principles for renaming.

Karen Bearor indicated that she'd had some difficulty, because she could see both sides of the issues, and noting the panel would have to remember that the naming occurred in the modern period, as opposed to a historical period, she opined that this was something they might want to consider.

Dr. Jones clarified by asking whether Dr. Bearor was referring to intent.

Dr. Bearor affirmed.

Mr. Hernandez suggested that along with intent, the panel should also consider including a principle that addressed impact. He stated that while rereading the public's comments from the Town Halls as preparation for today's discussion, he thought more and more about the difference between intent and impact, adding that when you think about the role of leaders in our history, how do we account for both the intent and the impact of our choices and decisions.

Dr. Anderson outlined that when thinking about principles, he would like to see if the panel could come-up with an initial list, which they could then take some time to review, and decide if there was anything they wanted to add or remove. He went on to propose that one of the principles listed should be about recognizing people in appropriate ways, for example, correctly recognizing the people who contributed to the founding of FSU, and another principle being that anything that currently exists is open to evaluation, based on the current contemporary values of the University.

Ms. Stoner referenced the examples that the panel had been given of principles other Universities had used, and commented that she liked some of the ones she had read, including a principle she thought was from Yale, which provided that there should be a bias toward maintaining a naming. She asserted that the panel should also include a principle that required the naming or recognition in question to be reviewed based on what was considered at the time of the naming, and the justification given in support of the recognition. Ms. Stoner opined that this would give the University an opportunity to assess if something was missing from the justification at the time that would be inconsistent with the University's values.

Ms. Gibbs offered that an example might be facts that have later come to light.

Mr. Hernandez suggested that the panel also consider who had/has a voice in these choices and to look at how we capture and include different members of our community and ensure that we give a voice to populations that have been historically excluded from this decision making process.

Ms. Jackson stated that she agreed with Dr. Jones' earlier comment, that a standard for naming and renaming might need to be analyzed differently, and referencing the information from Yale, stated that she also liked how their process indicated there was a strong presumption against renaming. She added that she thought it would be important to suggest a standard for analysis, which seemed to be a popular practice, but asserted that separate from other types of entities facing the same challenges, like government buildings and courthouses, FSU is an institution of higher learning, and one of the principles had to be that we are here to teach people about things, or something that referenced the part of our mission to further educate anyone who steps on our campus.

Lane Forsman opined that impacts on harm should take precedence over intent, and that the issue of historical accuracy was also something to keep in mind, noting that the claim of Eppes being the University's founder had become more tenuous, and that based on the evidence presented earlier, he may not have had the role we thought he did. Mr. Forsman also suggested that as a practice, any renaming should come hand in hand with something that explains how the change came to be, showing the process, the ultimate decision, and the reasons for it.

Mr. Hill indicated that he agreed with a lot of what the other panel members had said, including that there should be a difference in principles for namings and renamings. He added that he had found looking at other Universities to be helpful, and that specifically, he thought Yale's procedure and principles were clear and dependable. Mr. Hill went on to suggest that the panel keep the principles focused on the narrative and mission of our University, which he asserted was all about education, and should be at the core, since the University's goal was to educate anyone who stepped on campus. He referenced Yale's "Principles to be considered" again, noting that they seemed to be focused on the education side of thing and that he especially liked the last one.

Dr. Moore mirrored Mr. Hill in saying that he agreed with most of what was already said and had found both the Michigan and Yale articles to be most helpful. He referenced some key items he

had written down regarding Yale's procedure, stating that he thought the presumption against renaming was important to hold on to and that he had also really like the last principle Mr. Hill had mentioned. Dr. Moore moved to his notes on Michigan, noting that they had listed due diligence as a principle and proposed that a naming or renaming needs to be based on careful historical examination. He concluded that he also liked their principles about how honorific recognitions can have a significant difference on a group of another time and that the University had an obligations to ensure the removal does not have the effect of erasing history.

Dr. Bearor asserted that regardless of whether a building has a name or a statue was put-up, removing either does not erase history, as the people being recognized are still recorded in other historical documents. She added that we would still know these things without the representation and that she doesn't want the panel to associate removal of a name or statue, with the removal of history.

Dr. Jones responded that she disagreed, because the fact was we don't know our history and she felt that we needed to confront it. She opined that having the Eppes statue there allowed us an opportunity to recognize that the work of slaved people, and the money from their work, played a role in establishing our University. Dr. Jones indicated that we were good at hiding the ugly parts of history and that instead, we should use this opportunity as a teaching moment. She acknowledged that this may require raising money to put up another monument and/or to possibly offer another type of history course, but noted that she worried they would miss a great opportunity to teach if Eppes's recognition was removed.

Dr. Bearor agreed with the idea of this being an opportunity for a teachable moment, and suggested that it was their responsibility as educators to make sure they taught their students this information, but asserted that it could be done in different ways.

Ms. Stoner recalled that another University had created a course about the University's history, which they required their students to take.

Ms. Gibbs suggested that it was something to go back to, as well as why there is a statue of Eppes, and specified that it wouldn't be so much about looking at him as a person, but about why he was given the recognition. She proposed that the first step would be to figure out if he had done something to warrant the recognition as a founder and then they could refer to the principle about new information or facts coming to light that needed to be considered.

Dr. Anderson commented that the term "renaming" had been used a lot, but pointed out that there was also the issue of the Eppes statue to consider, and that within that context they would be looking at a removal, which he thought was somewhat different. He added that, as the panel developed these principles, he thought it would be helpful to frame them as questions that the committee could consider their answer to; for example, 'Is the recognition in-line with the University's values?'

Ms. Gibbs agreed and indicated that once everyone had provided their feedback regarding the principles, she thought the next step would be to put that all together, which she also believed would get them one step closer to their recommendation on Eppes and Roberts.

Dr. Anderson suggested that another questions be, “Is the recognition appropriate for the person, based on their contributions to the University?”

Mr. Hernandez noted that a couple of the principles from the Michigan document had stood out to him, including; the principle of interpretation, which stipulates that our responsibility to explain and interpret the name doesn’t end at the conclusion of the naming ceremony, and; the principle of contemporary effect, which outlines that honorifics given at one time can have significantly different effects on community members at another time. He indicated that a lot of what had been shared recently during public comments weighed heavily on him.

Allisson Yu stated that the Yale procedure had resonated with her as being very clear and going forward she thought the panel should start by looking closely at those to see what else might be missing. She added that she felt like Michigan was trying to be so completely comprehensive, that she got lost in some of the minutiae. Ms. Yu outlined that she thought the panel should recommend keeping the Eppes statue, but redo the plaque that marks him as the founder. She also suggested that they recommend moving forward with possibly renaming Roberts, and noted that while she understood the extra steps it would take, she struggled with recognizing someone who so clearly spoke out against desegregation.

Ms. Stoner agreed with Ms. Yu regarding her comments about Yale’s procedure, indicating that unlike Michigan, Yale not only outlined a set of principles to consider, they also established a procedure and asserted that the panel needed to be aware that both would be important to have in the final document. She commented that for Michigan the focus was really on namings and that FSU’s current policy was focused on donor naming, with a small note on values. Ms. Stoner opined that the panel needed to come-up with a better process.

Ms. Gibbs agreed and added that they would need to capture the intent in a way that a record of the process would be clear 50 years from now.

Ms. Gibbs asked if there were any other comments on principles.

Mr. Hill responded that he thought they should have presumptions and principles, noting that he agreed with the presumption that renaming should occur in rare cases.

5. Action Options

[Combined with previous agenda item]

6. Next Meeting Agenda

Ms. Gibbs stated that she appreciated Ms. Yu’s feedback on where we go next, and that transition to their discussion on next steps, she wondered if it would be helpful to take the principles mentioned today and put them together for the panel’s review. She suggested that the panel finish and agree on the principles first, then test the Eppes and Roberts landmarks to see where they might land with regards to their recommendation on what action to take.

Dr. Moore asked if he was correct in his understanding of what Ms. Gibbs was suggesting, which was that the support staff would draft a set of principles based on what was discussed during today's meeting and then send out to the panel, giving them time to review and suggest any changes they may have.

Ms. Gibbs confirmed that Dr. Moore was correct.

Dr. Moore followed-up by asking if the panel would need to submit their suggested edits prior to the next meeting.

Ms. Gibbs responded that she thought it would be fine for the panel to come ready to discuss at the meeting.

Mr. Hill asked if the panel would need to vote at some point in order to officially document their agreement on the principles.

Ms. Jackson advised that the panel would need to come to an agreement as a committee, but that administratively, this could be done by either a vote, or a consensus.

Dr. Anderson suggested that whenever the initial list of principles was sent to the panel, they should also be given a deadline by which any possible edits they may have needed to be sent to Ms. Staats, Panel Staff Support. He added that the deadline should be early enough to allow adequate time for Ms. Staats to incorporate any edits she received and still send the revised copy out to the panel for review before the next meeting.

Ms. Gibbs indicated that Dr. Anderson's suggestion made sense, and that she was fine with that plan.

Mr. Hernandez requested clarification regarding whether the list of principles being sent would specifically be about renaming and/or removing a current recognition.

Ms. Gibbs asserted that Mr. Hernandez was correct and that considering possible revisions to the University's Naming Policy would be the second part of their work, for which they would probably want to bring-in Dr. [Tom] Jennings again [VP for University Advancement] to ensure that their revisions could be smoothly incorporated into the current process for donor recognition.

Dr. Moore shared that he would be thinking about where he was with regards to Eppes and Roberts when reviewing the list of proposed principles and that he would make sure the principles he was basing his position on were represented in the list.

Ms. Gibbs suggested that this was something all of the panel members would want to do.

Ms. Stoner expressed appreciation for the examples given to the panel of principles used by other Universities, and noted that they had been very helpful.

Dr. Anderson stated that with regards to other namings and recognitions, as a part of their charge, the panel would need to take some time to evaluate current ones on campus, and to also think about what other types of recognitions might need to be added. He acknowledged that he wasn't sure when that part should happen, and asked if it should be included in any specific part of the recommendations the panel would be submitting to President Thrasher.

Ms. Gibbs asserted that while she didn't want to speak for President Thrasher, she thought that if the panel had any suggestions, he would be happy to hear them.

Ms. Stoner commented that hopefully everyone on the panel had had a chance to visit the Heritage Museum in Dodd hall and explained that as the stained glass windows were becoming filled with unsolicited donations, the idea came up to make sure that all of the significant pieces of our University's history were being represented, which resulted in them now actively looking for certain donations. She added that she liked the concept of having a committee, whose purpose would be to get together and see what was missing across campus, in statues and/or recognitions.

Mr. Hernandez noted that out of the 400 plus buildings on campus, the University didn't have a structure named after a FL Seminole, which he thought was something the panel should be looking at. He also mentioned Tonya Harris, the first black faculty member hired at the University, and the immense character that she showed by joining the faculty despite those that protested against it, indicating that he thought the panel should think about a way to physically represent this on our campus.

Dr. Jones stated that she appreciated Mr. Hernandez's suggestions, because she believed in taking a negative and turning into a positive. She added that the institution has become diverse, and while maybe not quite enough, we were moving in the right direction, which should be recognized.

Mr. Hernandez pointed out that some of the other Universities the panel had been following, didn't have the opportunity to really have much of an influence or choice regarding their final decision, due to various state regulations and statutes that restricted their options, and when thinking about the broader opportunities FSU could potentially have, he thought it would be interesting to see where we would ultimately sit, and how we would be portrayed in what encouraged us or motivated us in this moment in time.

Ms. Stoner indicated that she always thought back to the slave labor that built Westcott, and suggested that if the Eppes statue wasn't removed, some sort of recognition should be added to show the excellence of the slaves' contributions, which she thought President D'Alemberte had spoken to.

7. Other Business

Ms. Gibbs reminded the panel that the next meeting was scheduled for Friday, April 27th and indicated that she would aim to get the proposed draft of principles out no later than Monday,

April 23rd, in order to give the panel time to give feedback and make edits. She also informed the panel that she would go ahead and confirm a May 4th meeting, so that it was on the books, but assured them, that she would look at other times and find an option that didn't conflict with any of the commencement ceremonies scheduled that day.

Ms. Gibbs stated that before they adjourned, she wanted to give University Archivist, Sandra Varry an opportunity to come-up and answer a question that Mr. Hill had raised earlier in the meeting.

Ms. Varry shared that with regards to the land the University was originally built on, she was able to find a record of the purchase, and while Eppes was the person designated on the receipt for receiving the land, the only possibly reference we could find to a donor indicated that they may have been part of the Walker family.

8. Adjourn

Ms. Gibbs thanked Ms. Varry for the follow-up and everyone on the panel for their time, then adjourned the meeting.

Meeting ended at 10:50am.