

**Board of Directors – Quarterly Meeting  
Meeting Minutes**

**Date:** Wednesday, July 24, 2019

**Time:** 6:00-7:00 p.m.

**Location:** SPC EpiCenter, 13805 58<sup>th</sup> Street North, Largo, Conference Room 1-450

**Board members present:** Bridgette Bello, Ken Burke, Honorable George Greer, Richard Jacobs, Dr. Laurie King, Commissioner Kathleen Peters, Debra Prewitt, Honorable Irene Sullivan

**Board members absent:** Watson Haynes

**Ex-officio members present:** Dr. Tonjua Williams

**SPC Administration:** Dr. Jamelle Conner (V.P. Student Affairs), Dr. Mark Strickland (Provost, Seminole Campus)

**ISPS Team members present:** Ellen Fontana, Sharon Panov, Jacquelyn Schuett

**Guests present:** Kimberly Martin (Gregory, Sharer & Stuart), Steve Kornell (observer)

Items to Discuss	Actions
<p>1. Welcome / Call to Order</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Board of Directors (Introduction)</li> <li>▪ St. Petersburg College Staff (Introduction)</li> </ul>	<p>The meeting was called to order at 6:04 p.m. Self-introductions were made: Institute for Strategic Policy Solutions (ISPS) Board of Directors (BOD), St. Petersburg College (SPC) administration, ISPS staff, and guests.</p> <p><i>Dr. Williams</i> added that the ISPS program coordinator and executive director report to Seminole Campus Provost Mark Strickland who reports to VP of Student Affairs Jamelle Conner; therefore, ISPS falls under Student Affairs.</p> <p><i>Judge Sullivan</i> thanked Dr. Williams for coming and sharing her vision.</p>
<p>2. Review and approval of minutes from last meeting APPENDIX A</p>	<p>The minutes from the May meeting were unanimously approved.</p> <p><i>Refer to Appendix A.</i></p>
<p>3. Financial Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Annual Audit Summary: <i>Kimberly Martin</i> APPENDIX B</li> </ul>	<p><i>Kimberly Martin</i> from Gregory, Sharer &amp; Stuart presented the Annual Audit Summary and Financial Statements including Supplementary Information.</p> <p><i>Martin</i> reported that there were no issues with their findings, and, once again, ISPS received a clean audit opinion—no audit adjustment, no unrecorded accounting adjustments, and no disagreement with management. Highlights of financials recap as follows: Statement of Net Position—similar to last year’s, with an increase of funds due from SPC; Income Statement—shows the 3% endowment revenue was up, in-kind contributions (mostly advertising) was slightly down from last year, advertising and marketing was up, as were contributions and sponsorships; there was a slight increase in expenses due to a full-time position being filled. She thanked Ellen Fontana, ISPS CPA, for doing a great job with the Institute accounts.</p> <p><i>Judge Sullivan</i> added that it sounded very positive and thanked Ellen as well.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Current Status: <i>Ellen Fontana</i></li> </ul> <p>APPENDIX C</p>	<p><i>Refer to Appendix B</i></p> <p><i>Ellen Fontana</i> provided a review of the current financial status. Highlights as follows: Balance Sheet – shows a cash position of a little over \$18,000, assets include what’s due from SPC which could change at year-end when the earnings are received from the endowment. The Institute then pays the College to cover ISPS expenses; Budget to Actual – so far for the first quarter, the greatest cost was for food the Sea Level Rise conference in April, the conference also generated \$1,400 in revenue.</p> <p><i>Refer to Appendix C.</i></p> <p><i>Ms. Fontana</i> directed the Board to the proposed budget in the meeting packet and discussion occurred earlier on the agenda than planned since the current financial report is based on the projected budget. She explained there are two pieces to the ISPS budget (as indicated by the two columns on the budget report)—the Fund 21 and the 501(C)3. Her reports only reflect the 501(C)3 piece.</p> <p><i>Judge Sullivan</i> noted concern expressed at the last meeting regarding proposed budget figures provided, the budget to be approved (by email) at a later-than-usual date.</p> <p><i>Dr. Williams</i> said that after being notified by a board member regarding the significant decrease in figures on the proposed budget, she assured that the information was incorrect; there was some confusion and it had since been resolved. She then called attention to the current budget which reflects an increase of \$25,000, close to last year.</p> <p>The financial report and the annual budget were unanimously approved.</p>
<p>4. Election of Board Officers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Chair</li> <li>▪ Vice-Chair</li> <li>▪ Treasurer</li> </ul>	<p><i>Judge Sullivan</i> recommended all board officers stay on for another year in their current capacity: Irene Sullivan as Chair; George Greer as Co-Chair; Ken Burke as Treasurer. All agreed to another year. Election of officers was unanimously approved.</p>
<p>5. President’s Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ New Direction</li> </ul>	<p><i>Judge Sullivan</i> said the Board appreciated <i>Dr. Williams</i> being there, but expressed how concerning it was for board members attending the previous meeting where future programs were discussed (without reasonable budget information available to the director) to find out [David Klement] was let go and ISPS is going in a new direction.</p> <p><i>Dr. Williams</i> said that she, Mark Strickland, Jamelle Conner were present to share what they had learned about ISPS and where the Institute should be going. She added that it is difficult to attend all Direct Support Organization (DSO) meetings, making it a challenge to share concerns, directives and expectations of the college to the officers. In the future, she will do so—keeping in mind State standards regarding A&amp;P contract renewal. <i>Dr. Williams</i> said that according to the original founding documents, the Institute hasn’t hit the mark on what it was supposed to be doing—working with students, staff, and also having a state and national presence. The College made college-wide changes to strengthen some departments and change direction in others, waiting a full year to make deep detailed decisions to reach those goals—moving ISPS, not in a new position, but in the position for which it was designed. If that could have been done without certain changes it would have been done.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ History of the Institute (White Paper)</li> <li>▪ Bylaws and Articles of Incorporation</li> </ul>	<p><i>Dr. Williams</i> went on to say that the ISPS BOD should hold the College accountable if there are concerns, and that she, Mark Strickland, or Jamelle Conner are and would be available to address issues, provide updates, and support initiatives; requesting that questions or concerns be emailed to them a week or two in advance of meetings so that they can be prepared with the director to respond.</p> <p><i>Dr. Williams</i> said that attendance at ISPS events should be 500-600, and while the Institute is sending information out to a large group of people, only a small population (about 100 followers) attend all events and many students weren't even aware of the events. The College has large venues to carry a lot of people (suggesting a big monthly event) and ISPS presents the opportunity to do that; but there is a need to strengthen and expand the program, to be more inclusive of students, and, in relation to the State and throughout the state, to have larger crowds. That's the focus going forward, and the plan is to work collaboratively to make that happen, increase recognition and improve the reputation of ISPS.</p> <p><i>Dr. Williams</i> shared information regarding the history of the Institute as presented to her by Tom Furlong and as found in an agreement drawn up by many presidents in the Florida College System in 2010-2011, outlining the intent of the Institute and its obligation to the State. The agreement signed by a former SPC president was to allow SPC to have state funds for ISPS, provided the College worked statewide, including students, faculty, and community in bringing about civil discourse and discussion on hot topic issues. <i>Provost Mark Strickland</i> further noted that the original agreement predates former SPC president Bill Law and included Carl Kuttler. <i>Dr. Williams</i> added, the community from the State's standpoint includes other colleges and individuals from other areas of the State and nationally (for instance, Tallahassee and Miami-Dade, sister institutions).</p> <p>Copies of the agreement mentioned were not in the BOD meeting packet, but information on the agreement was communicated until copies of the original documents are made available by SPC Administration as requested by <i>Ken Burke</i>, stating that according to the governing documents he had received there is no state responsibility beyond the community and no obligation to serve Tallahassee or Miami-Dade. <i>Dr. Williams</i> said, that in order to receive the state funds, the College agreed to include the other state colleges; ISPS would do the work and have board members from other places, and include other presidents—that was what was stated to receive the funds. <i>Mr. Burke</i> added that the endowment received may have had a commitment to doing something different. There's a big difference between what was said to get the endowment, get the legislation passed, and what may have evolved. He asked for clarification as to whether it was a piece of legislation or an appropriation. <i>Ellen Fontana</i> answered that there was an appropriation but she didn't think the wording was appropriation, that a lot of this took place verbally. She could not recall specific wording, but to her understanding, it was to fill a larger purpose.</p> <p><i>Mr. Burke</i> further stated that, according to the governing documents, the Institute has been fulfilling what it is supposed to do. <i>Mark Strickland</i> responded, "not entirely." <i>Dr. Williams</i> directed the board to Article III, Sec. B., "to provide students, faculty, college employees and the community at large, a forum and center for learning and scholarly public discourse on key civic matters which may be local, regional, national or international in scope and impact." <i>Dr. Williams</i> added, the Institute is not doing enough—students are not benefiting. Faculty are not involved.</p>
--	---

*Mr. Burke* said that it seems, from reading over the documents, that the Board of Trustees (BOT) is the governing body over this board, and ISPS can be eliminated by the BOT. Also, that the ISPS board is not an advisory board. *Provost Strickland* clarified that the BOD's advisory duties pertain to fiscal responsibilities by way of approving budgetary items.

*Judge Sullivan* questioned whether ISPS has been achieving any of the original goals. *Dr. Williams* responded that the Institute has achieved goals, but hasn't expanded as far as it should. The scope was small. The College is trying to get more support, expand, move out; not have the majority of initiatives in one place, using different modalities for sharing. *Richard Jacobs* said that would require a lot of effort from everyone and broad base public communication, marketing, and budget. *Ellen Fontana* responded by reminding the Board of ISPS funds totaling \$200,000 that were not utilized.

*Dr. Williams* said the College has a strong marketing team, with abilities to advertise it differently, expand efforts. In the past, the Institute did its own advertising.

*Judge Sullivan* said she was not surprised at references to do things better with more student engagement, diversity of geographical areas in Pinellas County and better use of technology, but references made to our obligation to the State is something new.

*Richard Jacobs* noted Article 3 of the Bylaws mentions the Institute having outside memberships, and he was not aware of any. *Provost Strickland* said the membership was early on (called Village Square) but declined significantly and was dissolved. *Mr. Jacobs* suggested Article 3 be changed to clarify that. *Provost Strickland* said the new director will meet with the ISPS board, review the bylaws, and then make edits and necessary adjustments.

#### CONCERNS EXPRESSED:

*Dr. Williams* – Important questions are: “How are we marketing? Who are we inviting? Who are we asking to participate?”

*Bridgette Bello* expressed concern that there was no student engagement.

*Commissioner Peters* said the Institute is not getting good viewership and should be using social media to promote the program. ISPS should be using the College cable channel to broadcast (for instance the Sea Level Rise Conference) so that more people can see it live, nationally.

*Commissioner Peters* expressed concerns that the Institute fell short on marketing, social media, partnerships and sponsorships, student and staff engagement, change in locations, use of technology, and that those weaknesses were not addressed and followed through on. The focus now should be how to improve. The new director, in addition to general programming, should address those issues and resolve weaknesses.

*Mr. Burke* said concerns were expressed in previous board meetings regarding neutrality, avoiding bias in programming; it's important that the director is accountable to the BOD and acknowledges the Board as a governing body. *Commissioner Peters* agreed, stating concerns were voiced that the programming was not diverse or

balanced, but that's as far as it went; but no actions were taken by the Board to see that changes were followed through on.

*Mr. Burke* said the programming has to be non-political, and when the list of topics all seem to be associated with one political party it makes a difference. For example, event topics like the Green New Deal and doing away with the electoral college are one-party issues. *Commissioner Peters* said that no matter the political party, the right person should be able to speak on non-partisan issues—like homelessness and mental health. Even with the electoral college, with someone who has the ability to bring both sides together, there is a healthy debate. She suggested leaving it open to elected officials and local government is typically non-partisan. It's important to get the right person that can balance that, who values the debate and the conversation.

*Provost Strickland* directed the conversation to the skill set on the new job description "regarding ideas that are balanced around all political spectrums."

- Institute job description

*Judge Sullivan* asked if the Board would have any influence over the selection of the new executive director. *Jamelle Conner* responded that that was the original intention, and requested 1 to 2 board members serve on the hiring committee; adding that, as with other executive positions within the College, there will be an open forum with the finalists so that anyone can come and meet the candidates. *Judge Sullivan* asked *Kathleen Peters* to serve on the screening committee and called for another volunteer. *Bridgette Bello* offered. All approved. *Dr. Williams* added that faculty members and other individuals would be serving on the committee as well.

*Dr. Williams* referred the Board to copies of the executive director job descriptions (old version and draft of updated job description) in the meeting packet and asked that the Board offer input, requesting edits by Friday so that the final version be ready to post as soon as possible. *Provost Strickland* noted several changes to the new job description: educational requirements, position summary items taken from the articles of incorporation, and changes in the knowledge base and skills required, taking into consideration suggestions that some board members felt necessary to take the job to the next level (a balanced approach, for example).

*Judge Sullivan* asked if there is a position in the College comparable to this one. *Dr. Williams* responded that there is no comparable position (ISPS being one of three DSOs—the other two: a museum and the foundation).

*Mr. Jacobs* said the documents made it seem as though ISPS is a self-contained unit, which it isn't. It should be made clear to the new director that the Institute is a direct support organization.

*Mr. Jacobs* noted that the new job description does not include fundraising. *Mr. Burke* said that the Institute does receive sponsorships. *Ms. Fontana* noted the line item for sponsorships on the budget report. *Dr. Williams* said the director is not expected to raise large sums of money, only revenues generated from paid events.

*Commissioner Peters* noted references to a marketing person in the original documents, and that it may not be necessary for the director to have marketing skills if there's a direct relationship to the marketing team at the College, but should be proficient on how to promote. *Dr. Williams* responded that the College already does that.

*Dr. Williams* assured that the job expectations, what the ideal candidate looks like, is provided with the job posting and asked if more time was needed to go over the job description. *Judge Sullivan* accepted the draft as it is. *Provost Strickland* mentioned that a few board members mentioned sponsorship and marketing—neither of which is listed on the new job description.

*Commissioner Peters* expressed concern that the new executive director be provided with everything needed to be successful, noting that there were other positions mentioned in the original proposal that do not exist. *Dr. Williams* responded that the positions mentioned in the ISPS proposal were suggestions; adding, that once the new person is hired, needs will be accessed, the financial capabilities will be considered; but for now, she was sharing with the Board the vision on going forward and including the BOD in the hiring process; then after that, the new person will work with their supervisor and the Board on where to go next. *Commissioner Peters* said the College needed to make those commitments to provide resources for marketing strategies, including abilities to broadcast or livestream, technical support, up front, even prior to hiring. *Dr. Williams* responded that the College made those commitments (with the museum and the alumni association), but there was a lack of communication with ISPS.

*Mr. Burke* thanked Drs. Williams, Conner and Strickland for allowing the Board to be part of the hiring process; that it showed commitment to what the Institute is trying to do. He also urged expediency if there is a perfect candidate.

*Dr. Williams* asked for any concerns from the Board regarding currently scheduled events. None were stated at that time.

*Jacquelyn Schuett*, at the request of Richard Jacobs, addressed Sea Level Rise (SLR) and the letter from the SLR Collaborative, stating that the Institute was waiting for the Board after having reviewed the letter from the SLR Collaborative to provide direction before moving forward with programming for the Fall term. *Dr. Williams* said to wait until Spring to schedule a SLR event. *Provost Strickland* added that the College is on board, but the idea was to get feedback and input from the Board on the direction of SLR programming. *Richard Jacobs* said the Collaborative would be happy change the focus if necessary. *Commissioner Peters* stressed that even though (as mentioned by *Richard Jacobs*) the previous SLR conference was videoed and posted online, these types of events should be streamed. *Commissioner Peters* requested the link to the video. *Jacquelyn Schuett* added that all ISPS events are videoed and posted on the Institute's website: <https://solutions.spcollege.edu/>.

*Laurie King* said that when the Institute was started, there were partnerships with the Ethics and Public Policy programs. She would like to reenergize those partnerships.

*Dr. Williams* said the mental health forum needs to get to Marketing for the College's Facebook. *Jacquelyn Schuett* reported that the mental health forum is in preliminary stages, still in need of a title. *Commissioner Peters* added that the title should be simple. She said the speaker, Steve Leifman of Miami-Dade, will focus on the criminalization of mental health and efforts his office has taken to stop it. SPC's Project H.E.A.L., and Ruth Power, Program Manager for Central Florida Behavior Health will be on the panel. She said it was necessary for the forum to be livestreamed. Also, that ISPS should partner with BayCare since they are engaged in a marketing campaign on the topic.

- Future Programs

	<p><i>Dr. Williams</i> said ISPS should be thinking about events concerning upcoming elections.</p> <p><i>Judge Sullivan</i> suggested for Spring, an award-winning non-partisan documentary titled “Behind the Bullet” regarding gun violence. <i>Commissioner Peters</i> suggested it be shown on the anniversary of Marjorie Stoneman Douglas shooting, just not on Valentine’s Day.</p> <p><i>Jacquelyn Schuett</i> reported that ISPS had worked with Eckerd College and Legacy 56 to present a documentary by Clennon King. ISPS sponsored the speaker. Eckerd hosted the event. Attending was a very diverse audience. These partners would like to work together again. <i>Dr. Williams</i> asked if it had been filmed. <i>Jacquelyn</i> responded that only the student event at the Downtown campus was filmed, as the documentary was the main attraction for the evening event and the Q&amp;A was short.</p> <p><i>Mr. Burke</i> was interested in the attendance for the criminal justice reform event, adding that with Palm Beach doing needle exchange and judges having more say over mandatory sentencing, it is still a big issue. <i>Jacquelyn</i> could not recall the attendance count, but that the Institute has hosted several in conjunction with Project on Accountable Justice, and that typically, the attendance was good.</p> <p><i>Bridgette Bello</i> said the Board more information is needed on who attends events, demographics, etc. <i>Dr. Williams</i> agreed. A report should be presented to the Board.</p>
6. New Business	<p><i>Mr. Jacobs</i> suggested there be a student on the Board, perhaps a representative of student government. Everyone agreed that would be a good idea. <i>Dr. Williams</i> said those changes would be left to the new executive director and the Board.</p> <p><i>Judge Sullivan</i> would like to host a reception for the new director.</p>
7. Comments	
8. Wrap-up & Adjournment	<p>Next Board meeting:  <b>November 4, 2019</b>  6:00-7:00 PM  EpiCenter (Conference Room 1-450)</p>